6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Church. In these protest movements on the folk level, demand for acceptance on equal terms in an all-human brotherhood of men was emphasized.

In the meantime, with the increasing technological, economic, and intellectual advance of the West, the Western pressures against the Czardom were intensified. In order to meet this challenge and withstand the threat, the Czardom, by the time of Peter the Great, embarked on a series of reforms aimed at Westernization of the Empire, such as secularization of the State, bureaucratization, industrialization and mass education. As a result of such developments, a new elite of parvenu salaried bureaucracy, and of parvenu salaried military, distinguished by the rank and not by the possession of land, was gradually taking the place of the old service nobility as the main pillar of the Czardom. At the same time, the old nobility who were freed of their obligatory service to the State, became hereditary owners of their estates.

In this manner, the old service nobility evolved into a class of economically independent landed squires, even though losing their former political status and privileges, such as monopoly on land and on service. This new gentry however, were by tradition, upbringing, and personal traits, interested in ruling, in political and military careers, not in land cultivation or industry. Many of them, when without office, tended to lead a life of leisure, and to emulate Western manners and styles, to cultivate arts and letters and to indulge in philosophical speculation and formulation of political theories. Few showed an inclination to identify themselves with the productive strata of the population and to devote time and energy to improve techniques of economic production and management.

Such an attitude of the nobility was an important agent in the retarded economic growth of Russia and in the lack of development of a numerically strong and influential middle class, which might have served as a cementing force in a culturally and ideologically split society. And it was from among this leisured class of rural gentry who had lost their status as the main pillar of the Czardom, but who had also emancipated themselves from their economic dependency upon the Czar, that the first

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

leaders of an organized opposition to the Czarist autocracy were recruited.

By the nineteenth century, this landed gentry opposition to the Czarist regime took two main forms. One was pro-Western, seeking the reconstruction of the Czardom along humanistic, libertarian and juridical lines, brought about by the ideas of Humanism and Renaissance, by the Reformation and by the French and American Revolutions. The other was anti-Western, reacting against Western rationalism and materialism, against Western "heathenism" and cosmopolitanism, and against the Western system of impersonal formalism and open class strife which was beginning to infiltrate Russia.

In an attempt to bridge the widening cultural and ideological chasm between the ruling classes and the common folk, the anti-Westerners exalted the anarchic community relations and equalitarian and humanist values of the Old-Slavonic world and of the Russian peasant commune. But they also emphasized the value of the Church-State unity, and sought a Messianic redemption of the whole world through the absorption of the State by the Orthodox Church and reestablishment of a paternalistic system of community relations ruled by collective conscience and based on Christian love and compassion.

In the meantime, that is, by the second part of the nineteenth century, with the growing impoverishment of the rural gentry and with increasing educational opportunities for all strata of the population, the ranks of the educated classes (*intelligentsia*) were being swollen by many declassed people as well as by increasing numbers of young people from the families of clergymen, of lower government employees, of petty tradesmen and other lower classes (*raznochintsy*). Even though Czardom at the time was still governmentalized to a high degree, it was not totally regimented. Moreover, by the second part of the nineteenth century, under the pressure of the West, and in order to match the military, the educational, the industrial and the social levels of the Western world, Czardom abolished serfdom and made other concessions in the direction of a libertarian and a juridical state. This trend of events reinforced the penetration of Western political and social philosophies which tended

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[XIX century]

517
178
177
565

to undermine the existing Church, State and family system based on self-abnegation and on unconditional submission.

517
668

As a result, a number of raznochintsy intelligentsia, freed of fear and awe before God, the Czar and the Father, but feeling thwarted in their political ambitions and socially rejected, expressed their dissatisfaction and their hostility toward the existing conditions of inequality and oppression by developing ideologies of denial and destruction. Their aim was to reject and to annihilate all the basic institutions and authorities on which Czardom rested: the family, religion, property, the power of the Father, the authority of the Church, as well as the rule of the Czar. These revolutionaries denied God and conscience as well as any existing ethics or rules of conventional conduct. They sought to destroy Czardom "root and branch" and to seize power for themselves by all and any means. Their professed objective was to establish on the earth an all-human stateless society of totally free men living in a system of equalitarian justice and fraternal love.

Thus, while seeking to reestablish the anarchic and group-oriented values of the early Slav folk and of the Russian peasant commune, these revolutionaries exhibited also Messianic power-centered urges and destructive drives common in the ruling classes of Czardom. Hence a number of these people became professional conspirators, advocating establishment of an underground organization with rigidly centralized total power commanding expendability of its members, and demanding their complete dedication to the cause of the revolution. They considered this system of organization to be the only effective way to fight the Czarist rule. In this "mortal struggle," these dedicated young men and women tolerated no opposition or differences of opinion, propagated extreme hatred and pitilessness in dealing with all adversaries, organized assassinations, mutinies, strikes and mass risings, thus preparing the ground for the ascendancy of Bolshevism.

The Bolsheviks were a group of professional conspirators. In common with Messianic and power-oriented aims of all raznochintsy, the Bolsheviks endeavored to seize absolute and total power exclusively for themselves, by any and all means, as a way

1 [i.e. of undermining due to penetration of western influences -- Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

174 to maintain a system of economic self-sufficiency which was restricted to small villages or groups of such villages.[1]

175 181 In early documents these Old-Slavonic plowmen are described as peaceful, moderate, mild, and humane, patient and sober, disinterested in power, hard working, living in social and political democracy. They are pictured as being opposed to subjection, but unable to offer much resistance to a foreign aggressor since they were not skilled in warfare. Procopius (6th century), for instance, said that "these people are not ruled by one man, but they have lived from of old under a democracy, and consequently everything which involves their welfare, whether for good or for ill, is referred to the people."[2] And Emperor Leo (9th century) stated the following:

> . . . jealous of their liberty they have always refused to submit themselves to the Empire. . . . even those who have accepted Christianity keep as much as they can the forms of their ancient freedom. . . . This is a numerous nation, patient in difficult times, and very industrious. Heat, cold, hunger, and want of all things do not beat down these people. . . . They used to be very hospitable and still maintain with great care this virtue. They are affable people and receive travellers with much kindness, show them the way, and protect them against insult. If a traveller would not be well treated by his host because of host's fault all the people would attack the host. They behave with much gentleness also toward their slaves; they do not condemn them to perpetual slavery, but fix a time of service . . . after which time . . . they free them. The women are well-behaved, and attached to their husbands. . . . These people are very frugal . . . they prefer to live with much freedom. . . . They like to take refuge in the woods or in inaccessible places.[3]

175 631 The people of Polesie seem to have been politically organized in a system of smaller groupings of self-governing villages or even in single autonomous villages connected among themselves, not in the form of a central authority or state, but rather as a ● [565] loose confederation of independent units. Apparently, there were no marked social distinctions or differences in class and rank in this society. There was no aristocracy, no separate class of priests or warriors, no cities, no temples. There was, therefore, no class or clique which sought power and expansion over others,

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Eurasian steppes. As it had been a long-established practice among these predatory marauders, the war leader who showed himself competent in organizing a successful war expedition or in controlling a certain area would soon collect a considerable retinue of warriors. When Slavicized, the chieftain of such a band of raiders was known as *voyvoda* (warleader) or *knyaz* (prince). His retinue became known as the *druzhina* (band). The most outstanding members among these *druzhiniki* (band-men) and *muzhi* (men) formed an inner advisory body (*veche*) to the warleader or prince and became known as the "leading men" (*muzhi perednie*), or *boyari*. The voyvoda would reward his druzhina or boyars for their services by granting them land and dividing war booty with them.

It is important to note, however, that the boyars at this time received the granted lands as perpetual hereditary homesteads, and that they were free to leave one prince and enter the service of another at any time.[11] Before the formation of the Muscovite Empire, the plains between the Volga and Dnieper rivers were controlled by numerous such petty potentates, each surrounded by a retinue of boyars and other servicemen. Under those conditions there was no possibility of preventing these professional warriors from leaving one warleader and entering into the service of another. The only way for a local prince to retain his druzhina was by being successful in warfare, collecting large war booty, and offering land and villages together with the peasants in hereditary possession to his comrades in arms.[12]

In the meantime another stratum of the population was being formed in the centers of trade, that of the city people or burghers. The nomadic conquerors were not only looters and pirates, but traders as well. They traded in what they looted. When their authority was well established, they endeavored to promote centers and routes of commerce as a means of increasing their wealth. It was in these centers of trade and market places that cities developed. Soon city people became stratified into the well-to-do (*zhitie lyudi*) and the lower urban classes (*molodshie lyudi*). In these urban centers where the warriors became traders the trend was toward concentration of power in the hands of the economically powerful, just as among the professional military

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

class the tendency was toward the concentration of power in the hands of the more mighty princes.[13]

This concentration of power in the hands of the city plutocracy found its expression in the principle of an unanimity vote in the city assembly (*Veche*). Data on the early political and social organization of the Russian urban communities show that the unanimity in decisions was the rule. The old documents about these gatherings tell us that "what has been established by the oldest city, is maintained by its boroughs," that "all thought and spoke as one man," that "all were unanimous in the desire," and that the decision was reached "by all the oldest and all the youngest men of the assembly."[14]

But we also learn that this unopposed group consensus was achieved by means of threat and terror against all those who might show an inclination to disagree or who disagreed after the assembly had been held and after a resolution had been passed. The dissenters were often beaten with rods, despoiled of their property, or murdered. Sometimes they might escape such fate if ready to pay a fine that varied according to the rank of the dissenter. In this manner a minority, backed by physical force was able to enforce its will on the rest under the guise of "unanimity."[15]

Pressure for the unanimous consent on the part of the people was applied also in the village assemblies, and later in the land commune (*mir*). In some other customs of the Great-Russian peasantry, even in our own times, the unanimous consent was considered necessary. In marriage ceremonies, for instance, custom demanded that the bride when leaving her parental home obtain blessing from all her neighbors. There was, however, a threat against neighbors who refused their blessing. Curses were invoked against them: "Those who do not bless her, may they never marry their sons and daughters" (*Kto ne blagoslovit tomu vek sinov ne zhenit a docheri za muzh ne vdavat*).[16]

The principle of unanimity was apparently the procedure in the local assemblies of the Old-Slavonic soil cultivators of the Dnieper river basin. Such an unanimity was also practiced until our times in the Zadruga society of Croatia.[17] But in those pacific and anarchic societies the principle of unanimity was real, not

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

events were apparently manifested in a widespread sense of emotional and physical insecurity which fostered destructive aggression and mass violence. In such circumstances extreme self-seeking and dominance-submission relationships tended to substitute the Old-Slavonic egalitarian and anarchic system.

The plight of the Slavonic peasant strata has been symbolized in these products of folk imagination in the person of Mikula Selyaninovich ("the Villager's son") and in that of Ilya of Murom, who is often referred to as "the peasant's son," and as "the old Cossak." Mikula is pictured as a superb plowman and field laborer. He has a keen knowledge of husbandry and possesses the best mares and the best farming equipment.[24] He is endowed with such tremendous strength and is entrusted with such heavy responsibility that he carries "the weight of the whole world" in a little shoulder bag. This villager, however, comes into conflict with the city people over the custom duties and over the haughty manner of the urbanites. The tolls imposed by the city are too high. Moreover, the burghers treat Mikula in a despicable and undignified way. So he is enraged and loses his self-control:

> I was in the city no longer ago than the day before yesterday,
> On my light bay mare,
> I carried thence two whole bags of salt,
> Two bags of salt of forty pud each.
> The folk there are no better than robbers.
> They demand two kopecks toll;
> But I had a leaded whip for toll
> I paid their two kopecks toll.
> Whoever was upright I left seated
> And whoever was seated I left prostrate,
> And whoever lay prostrate would never rise again.[25]

As a result of such conflicts, Mikula finally came to the conclusion that tilling was not profitable any more. He found that there were other and better ways which would guarantee to one safety, economic gain, and self-respect. So he gave up husbandry and joined Volga Buslavlevich, the bandit-warrior. In his new role in which he uses great physical power not as a productive force, but as a means of coercion, he makes a strong imprint on

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

the mind of the burghers. As a result, the city folk changed their attitude and instead of haughty bearing they now "bow low" to Mikula.

Ilya of Murom, the other hero of peasant origin, is portrayed as "being crippled" for many years. Then suddenly he acquires gigantic strength from two sources: from psalm singers and from Svyatogor, a hero of supernatural origin and superhuman powers. By means of this acquired strength and by employing cunning, Ilya gets rid of Svyatogor and, like Mikula, joins the bandit-warriors. However, the professional warriors do not accept Ilya on equal terms because of his low origin. But by constant demonstration of superior physical strength employed as a means of intimidation Ilya is finally accepted by the ruling military aristocracy. After a terrifying demonstration of physical strength which shook the whole town to its foundation Prince Vladimir became so panicky that he hurried a messenger to humbly invite Ilya to a prince's feast:

> Knock upon the door five times
> Then cross yourself in the prescribed manner
> Make your bow as it is enjoined,
> Offer humble salutations, and beat with your forehead
> Upon the floor of bricks,
> Upon damp mother earth herself,
> Before the old Cossack, Ilya of Murom.[20]

It seems clear that in these two heroes of peasant origin we find reflected the vicissitudes to which the Old-Slavonic society has been exposed after it has been subjugated to warriors and traders. The moral and productive values of the peasants, symbolized by Mikula's strength, his skill in productiveness, his social responsibility and feelings of dignity and equality, were rapidly declining in the changing conditions. The peasants became an easy prey of the new ruling classes. The result was moral corruption on the part of the soil cultivators, disinterest in land, and an urge to revolt. The peasantry became "crippled." First they expected help from supernatural forces. Then finally they began to rely on guile and on terror to protect themselves. They realized that in the new political atmosphere it was superior physical force which was admired and respected. Many peasants

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia: RF1

territories. He was adorned with the title of the "Metropolitan of Kiev and of all Russias,"[4] a symbolic beginning of Russian religious and political unity.

When the Tartars in the beginning of the thirteenth century imposed their overlordship over all Russian lands, lacking an efficient administration and interested not so much in governing as in tributes, they restored to the native princes their old titles and gave them the right to collect tributes for them. In this manner in the beginning of the fourteenth century Ivan Kalita of Moscow succeeded in obtaining a *yarlyk* (charter of privileges) in which the Tartar Kahn recognized Ivan as the *Veliky Knyaz* (Grand Prince). A few years later Ivan also became the chief collector of tributes for the Kahn in Russian lands.

In his function as chief farmer of internal revenues Ivan practiced extortion from his Russian subjects and acquired a great personal wealth. His riches enabled him to purchase entire domains and apanages, and to buy the protection and backing of the Kahn. Seeing the ascendency of Ivan, and following Byzantine traditions of Church and state unity, the Metropolitan of Kiev and of all Russias moved his residence to Moscow and built a cathedral there, ready to support Moscow princes in their political ambitions.

The expansion of Moscow's power over other Russian lands was favored also by external circumstances and pressures. By the second part of the fourteenth century the central authority of the Tartar Empire, the Golden Horde, had weakened and as was customary in Turco-Mongol society, civil wars ensued among the contenders for the throne. This situation presented an opportunity for power wise princes of Moscow to change their policy of cringing and prostration before the Tartars into that of rebellion and bargain. From now on at times they fought the Tartars, at other times they were again kneeling before them; but they now knew how to take advantage of Tartar weaknesses and how to gain new possessions with Tartar assistance. In this policy of expansion at the expense of other Russian principalities the Muscovites had the support not only of the Khans but that of the Eastern Orthodox clergy as well. Their

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

177 642 The ideology of Moscow imperial theocracy was rooted in the power-centered traditions of Russian princes, reinforced by a fusion of Mongol and Byzantine political ideas and practices. As among the Mongols, the Czar was considered to be the supreme owner of the body and of the property of his subjects, but as among the Byzantines he was also concerned with their souls. At the same time, according to the Muscovite political philosophy, the Czar as owner of his subjects derived his authority not from the people, as in Byzantium, but directly and exclusively from God.[7] Therefore, the Czar alone possessed rights, his subjects only duties.

643

In the Muscovite system of theocratical power not only was the Czar's freedom unlimited by any laws, but his personal will was not limited by any recognized human rights either. The Czar was considered to be limited only by his duty to God and by Divine law. The Czar, however, was himself the sole judge of his duty to God. He himself was the sole interpreter of Divine Law in regard to temporal affairs. Even the head of the Church could only supplicate but not advise him in these matters. The Czar was therefore at liberty to use the law capriciously as an instrument of his personal power, or to break the law at his convenience. And so he often did.[8]

643 565 Supported by the imperial ambitions of the Church, Muscovite rulers had two main objectives. One was the solidification of the unlimited personal power of the Czar to which all institutions of law and order were subjected; the other consisted of territorial expansion at the expense of the neighboring countries. The hereditary magnates—the local princes and the boyars—were obstacles in the path of both of these objectives. This landed aristocracy, following the traditions of early Russian princes, insisted on their personal and manorial privileges and resented any interference of the Muscovite Czar. They were therefore in favor of limitation of the Czar's power.

565 [643] At the same time, however, these magnates were members of an advisory council to the Czar (*Boyarskaya Duma*); in this council some of them were closer to the Czar and formed an inner circle which exerted more power and influence on the affairs of the state. The boyars were therefore not unified and did not

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

form an organized opposition; instead they fought among themselves over priority in rank and position (*mestnichestvo*), over estates and crownlands, and over the favors of the Czar.

The lack of unity and struggle for power existed also among the lesser nobility, most of whom obtained their rank not by right of inheritance but by the favor of the Czar or as a reward for their military services. Some of these service nobility were rich in vast possessions, others did not differ much from common peasants in the amount of land they possessed, in standard of living, and in formal education.

Internal squabbles among the landed magnates and the service nobility were weakening the strength of the Czardom in relation to its adversaries. This situation offered a strong argument in favor of the Czar's despotism and at the same time eased the crushing of the opposition in the interest of unlimited power. "If subjects submit not themselves unto their ruler, never shall strife cease in the land," said Ivan the Terrible.[9]

The best way to break the power of the landed aristocracy was by making them economically dependent upon the Czar. This objective was achieved in two ways. One was forceful expropriation, resettlement, imprisonment and assassination of recalcitrant boyars. The other consisted of the increased emphasis on *pomestie* system of conditional land tenure as against *votchina*, or hereditary land property.

According to the pomestie system, which followed Mongol traditions, the crown lands, together with the peasants settled on them, were donated to the holder of an office or of a military rank under the condition of obligatory and loyal service to the Czar, and only as long as the loyal service on the part of the land recipient lasted. The *pomeshchik* was obliged to provide a contingent of soldiers according to the size of his donation. This obligation devolved from father to son. The older sons would obtain from the Czar new pomesties and the youngest son would, as a rule, inherit the pomestie of his father.[10] In the Byzantine Empire, too, the land was given in reward for service, but there the land became hereditary property that could be disposed of at will by the holder. In Russia the system of conditional land ownership meant, like in the Mongol political system, complete

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

565 423 701 dependency of the land recipients upon the Czar, because the Czar could at any time withdraw the grant.

642 565 423 By means of the pomestie system of land tenure which prevailed in the second part of the sixteenth century the Muscovite rulers obtained both of their objectives: unlimited power and permanent war preparedness. Once the owners of the estates became dependent upon the Czar for the possession of their lands, any opposition on their part could be crushed easily, especially if the caste solidarity and the development of an *esprit de corps* among these people could be prevented. By the end of the seventeenth century the hereditary land tenure and the conditional land tenure were equalized. As a result all nobility became service nobility (*dvorianstro*), dependent upon the Czar for their lands. All therefore became *holopy*, the slaves of the supreme *gosudar* (master). Neither type of land holder could alienate his land either by sale, exchange, or any other process. The principle was that "He who owned land should serve the Czar."

178 642 565 Thus, by the end of the seventeenth century, by making the nobility economically dependent and having the support of the Church, the Muscovite Czars were enabled to eliminate all potential opposition to their rule and to perpetuate their despotic power. After the nobility was subdued and regimented, the other classes, including the clergy, followed suit. By the end of the seventeenth century the slaves and free land tenants were equalized and bound to the land and burghers were bound to their [486] *posads*. It was prohibited for any person to move from one town or borough to another without special permit. There could be a penalty of death for such flight or desertion.

By this time, therefore, all persons were bound to their status. A rigid caste system was established for the purpose of securing for the Czar permanent and controllable bodies of people whose function was either to pay cess or to render military and state service. The whole state was regimented and militarized for the [641] purpose of the Czar's aggrandizement, defense of the realm and military campaigns; each person had one duty only—to serve the Czar and the country. The whole society was geared to increase the revenues and the military might of the Czardom.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

III

The atmosphere of despotism, servility, fear and awe which developed under this system of total regimentation and dependency left an imprint on the habits and the attitudes of the people and had some influence on the shaping of their values and of their views of life. In conditions of complete dependency and domineering-subservience relationships, self-concern, destructive aggressiveness, as well as fatalistic resignation, are likely to thrive, not personal and social responsibility, moral obligations or group solidarity.

This trend of events meant also increasing social restlessness and political instability which in turn favored the rise to leadership of ruthless power-seekers and psychopaths. Lack of limitation on the personal power of the Czar, dissensions among the nobility and want of responsibility and of emotional balance in the person of the Czar led often to extreme excesses in Czar's rule.[11] All the attempts of the boyars to transform the Boyarskaya Duma into a legislative body were unsuccessful. Since the end of the seventeenth century even the *Zemski Sabor*, the consultative body of representatives of all classes, ceased to be convoked.

Only when the throne became vacant and the omnipotent Czar was gone did this nobility sometimes attempt to squeeze out promises and pledges from the pretenders to the throne. But, even then the remnants of the old boyar class and the new service nobility clashed over the question of control. Hence as soon as the new monarch was installed he did not have any difficulty in establishing his unlimited control and in proceeding to rule arbitrarily in face of a divided dvorianstvo.

The Czar could do anything he pleased with the nobles, including personal chastisement. They were treated as minors by the Czar and trained in blind and unconditional obedience. In the Czar's presence they observed dead silence. Anything that came from his hand, even the most degrading treatment, was to be received with resignation or even regarded as a sign of distinction. At the same time, however, while the nobles were exposed to all kinds of threat, terror and indignities on the part

7 [i.e. Czardom by end of 17th century.. Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

of the Czar, they became increasingly rank-conscious, domineering and abusive toward all lower in rank or under their power.[12]

Such a ruling class, with its open misrule and arbitrariness, could not inspire the subjected classes with confidence and respect. The lack of social and political security was manifested in want of initiative, in disinterest in productive activities, in loose morals, in hazard games, in a low value of human life, and in a general lack of trust.[13]

On the other hand, perhaps as a reaction to these conditions of insecurity and of social disorganization, there was an urge of complete renunciation of the world and its strife, an urge to detach oneself from the group, a tendency to isolate oneself completely from human society and seek personal consolation and personal salvation in religion. This trend of social withdrawal and self-oriented feelings brought about a great development of hermitism and of monastic life. Many of these people, completely detached from human society and preoccupied exclusively with their own self, sought peace and communion with God in lonely, remote depths of forests, in the solitude of the wilds and deserts. Here "far removed from men" they spent their lives in prayer, fasting and self-maceration.

At the same time the masses of the people who lived in great misery and who were exposed to arbitrariness, exploitation, and other forms of oppression on the part of the mighty, sought consolation and hope in supernatural forces. Beliefs in miraculous powers of wonder-working icons and in life-giving properties of the Cross were taking deep roots. On all sides sprang up prophecies and apparitions. Saint men and prophets, often mentally unbalanced, would appear in the streets and openly voice their protest against the Czar and his government.[14]

These were the only signs of an open opposition to the existing system that was becoming increasingly unbearable. Such "idiots" were considered saintly by the people not only because of their strange behavior and their ability to endure extremes of hardship, but also for their unheard of courage to speak openly against the Czar:

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

From its very inception the Russian state was a military soci-
721 ety. The military campaigns and territorial expansion were
● 565 needed in this society to provide land to pay for the services of
181 a class of military nobility whose chief occupation was state service and warfare, not land cultivation. War gave the Czar an opportunity to distribute land grants, to bestow ranks and offices and to win the support of the nobility. At the same time warfare offered an opportunity for the nobles to exert more personal power, to release their destructive urges, and to compensate for indignities and humiliations to which they were constantly exposed on the part of superiors in rank and office. Thus, by engaging these people in constant warfare the Czars directed their aggressive impulses against the enemy instead of against the ruler. The wars were not only a means of occupying a potentially restless and turbulent military class, but they were necessary to enhance the Czar's prestige, to solidify his rule, and to impress his subjects with the idea of his might and invincibility.

723 In such circumstances, prolonged and costly wars were to be avoided. The military nobility, whose loyalty to the Czar was conditioned upon his power and favors, could not be completely depended upon to remain loyal to the Czar under adverse conditions or in defeat. Therefore, in military campaigns the em-
725 phasis had to be put on numerical superiority over the enemy. Another way of fighting the enemies was to frighten them into retreat by sudden and unexpected attacks from ambush combined with wild sounds of the drums, trumpets and shouting, in Mongol fashion. Soldiers and officers were ready to flee if the enemy showed considerable resistance. Their preference was fighting from a distance, or from a place of advantage from where they could annoy the enemy, but hurt themselves least.[16] Hence their most common way of taking cities and fortresses
[726] was by a siege, in the course of which they would force the population to surrender by means of mass starvation, or by provoking internal dissensions and treachery.[17] Small, weak and unprotected adversaries would be threatened into submission by "psychological warfare" methods without even resorting to an open war.[18]

727 In earlier days, the means employed to keep conquered people
636 in submission were the same as those practiced toward Russian

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFl Great Russia RFl

Church tended to lead an inactive life of asceticism aimed at personal salvation.[1]

However, from the seventeenth century on, Russia's expansion, which was earlier oriented mainly toward the East, turned westward. The wars with the West which heretofore were mainly defensive, tended to acquire an increasingly offensive character. But the wars with the advanced Western countries were more difficult and much more costly than those with the economically and technologically backward Asiatics. The defeats which Russia suffered at the hands of the Swedes and Poles made it imperative for the Czars to increase the military effectiveness of their country to meet the challenge. This need dictated changes in the internal structure of the Czardom, in the direction of administrative and industrial advance along European patterns. Even before Peter the Great, measures had been taken in this direction. But it was Peter who dramatized the issue by himself going abroad as an apprentice in Western industries to become "the first carpenter of the Empire."

In accordance with such need the old system of administration based on service nobility was replaced by a system of salaried officials (*chinovnichestvo*). According to this *chin* (civil rank) system which was introduced by Peter the Great and which followed the Western pattern it was no longer necessary to belong to the dvorianstvo class in order to obtain state service. On the contrary, any one who served faithfully and efficiently could rise in chin and rank and thus obtain the status of a hereditary or of a personal *dvoryanin*, without even owning land. In this way a new salaried military and bureaucratic caste, entirely dependent upon the Czar, was growing at the expense of the landed dvorianstvo. As a result, the dvoryanin-guardsman, the chief state functionary of the eighteenth century, was replaced by the *chinovnik*-commoner in the nineteenth century. Chinovnichestvo absorbed and replaced dvorianstvo—just as earlier the dvorianstvo had absorbed and replaced boyarstvo. Now bureaucracy instead of military nobility became the main instrument of governing.[2]

This change in the structure of the Czardom, however, was accomplished from above, that is, by means of imperial decrees,

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

not by means of a popular revolution as in the West. Accordingly the new bureaucratic rule was based on the *Ukaz*[3] and the knut as much as the old order. For the same reason, though the state was formally secularized, the traditions of an autocracy, divinely ordained and supported by God, were carried on by every official as the representative of the Czar.[4]

Therefore the new system of autocracy based on bureaucracy, the same as the old one based on service nobility, could not recognize any political or personal rights of the subjects. Nor could there have developed any *esprit de corps* among the new governing class. This new class of officials owned little or no land and had to live on meager salaries, but was eager to follow the traditions and the high standards established by the old landed nobility. The chinovnichestvo therefore became even more dependent upon the Czar than the dvorianstvo was earlier. There was even less *esprit de corps* and less solidarity in the new governing class than in the old. Each official was constantly in fear of jeopardizing his own social position if he stood up in defense of any of his colleagues. Besides, in this hierarchical system of power the ruin or falling into disfavor of one official often meant the ascendancy of the other. There was, therefore, a tendency to take advantage of such a situation, to resort to intrigues and calumnies, and to help to destroy rather than to rehabilitate a victim.

All the powers, the lawmaking, the application of law, and the justice were placed into the hands of these bureaucrats. At the same time the system of checks and controls was very deficient. Laws were enacted by special temporary commissions of high officials, and created *ad hoc*. The Council of State, a supreme policy-making body, composed of about seventy to eighty highest dignitaries, was appointed by the Czar to serve him only in advisory capacities. The final decision rested in the hands of the Czar, or with the camarilla clique which happened at the moment to be most influential. The Empire was administratively divided into provinces (*gubernia*) which were usually headed by army generals. The gubernias were divided into districts which were headed by chiefs of police. The governors, supported by the police, ruled autocratically in their domains. They were

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

was invested with the most extensive powers and was given as its special mission the task of looking after the safety of the state and overseeing the doings of all departments, of all public functionaries, and of all people. The security police was an omnipotent and all-powerful body before whom all subjects were considered guilty unless they proved the contrary. This institution—developed in the course of centuries—became of paramount importance to its rulers. It became one of the most essential wheels of the government and one of the chief cares of the ruling class.[16]

III

Hierarchical relations of strict superordination and subordination in the military and bureaucratic ranks might foster feelings of identification with the mighty and the powerful. It is on such grounds that imperialistic nationalism and ideas of national superiority and grandeur thrive. And when state is fused with the Church in a system of theocratic militarism then nationalism might acquire also the aspects of religious fanaticism.

Expansion, greatness of the state, ideas of grandeur and Messianic ideas of world redemption or world domination might provide also compensation for humiliations, self-abasement, feelings of inferiority and unworthiness and other frustrations which are fostered in a system of abusive domineering-subservience relationships. As a result love of show, display of military might and need for conquests preoccupied the ruling strata of post-Petrine Russia as much as those of the Muscovite state. The Czar's court, the nobility, the military, the bureaucracy, the Church, the cities and the villages tended to display a grandeur that was in sharp contrast with the poverty of the country.[17]

This tendency toward exhibitionism and ideas of greatness was manifested also in the glorification of Russia, and the belief in the sacredness of its exalted mission in the world. Such attitudes and feelings which were rooted in the rigidly hierarchical military and bureaucratic structure were supported also by the Third Rome traditions of the Russian Church according to which Providence itself had bestowed upon Russia's rulers the role of the redeemers of mankind. According to these traditions and teachings Russia was a God-chosen country, the only country

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

sible for the whole amount of the tributes and taxes assessed. It was, therefore, in the interest of this land tax commune to favor concentration of power in the hands of the household head and to support his strictness in rule so that each household might contribute at the end of the fiscal year its share of the common tax assessment. With the lack of such a system of control, the taxes of the defaulters might fall on other members of the village community.

To meet the obligations to the tax commune it was necessary for each household to have sufficient manpower and all the farm equipment it needed. Household partition, which implied dispersal of manpower, need for new equipment, and increased taxation, was therefore frowned upon. Loitering or prolonged absence from the community also had to be discouraged. Early marriages, joint households, and rigid supervision by the elders were fostered. In addition, internal household conflicts provoked by forced regimentation and intensified because of lack of privacy, crowded quarters, insufficient food and clothing increased the need for autocratic rule:

> All in the household well know and have learned by experience that in the interest of the well-being of the household it is absolutely necessary that all obey one elder, who has knowledge and experience about the household and upon whom would depend all matters of husbandry.[4]

The landed nobility and the land-owning Church also supported the absolute power of the bolshak and disapproved of household partitions on their estates. The estate owners were bound to furnish the timber and other materials for the construction of new izbas in case of the division of an old household. They also had to provide the new households with farm equipment, all of which was a burden because it implied additional expense for the landlords. At the same time the government, which was constantly engaged in warfare and was increasingly in need of new recruits, found it more expedient to get these from large households so that the tilling of the soil would not suffer and the tax-paying powers would not decrease while military campaigns were taking place. Therefore, all the authori-

3: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ties—the state, the Church, the landlords, and the village tax commune—joined hands in backing the collective household system and the power of its head elder.

II

In this manner, under the pressure of circumstances, the *bolshaya* system of jointly ruled community household was gradually giving way to the *otsovskaya* system, that is, the patriarchal family in which the power-oriented steppe traditions tended to take precedence over the Old-Slavonic egalitarianism. Patriarchal traits prevailed especially in the urban strata. The father became absolute master as well as the exclusive owner of the family property in the otsovskaya system. As a result of this change in household structure all family members became economically and personally dependent upon the father; and as long as his power was supported by the state and the Church, they were expected to submit unconditionally to his will; there was no appeal against his arbitrariness, favoritism, and even misbehavior.

As a result of such a development the steppe traditions of life and death power of the father over his wife and children, the relationship of absolute dominance and complete subordination tended to be reinforced and perpetuated. The Church was particularly instrumental in this matter. Under the influence of the Church the father was likened, in the popular mind, to the Almighty. "As God is to the people, so is a father to his children" (*Kak Bog do lyudey, tak otets do detey*),[5] the people would say.

The father had at his disposal a number of ways to impose his will. Owing to the Church teachings, one of the main paternal sanctions consisted of invoking God's wrath This was done by means of malediction or withdrawal of blessing. Parental curse, as well as lack of parental blessing, was certain to bring great misfortune to the disobedient child (*Lisheniem otsovskogo blagoslovenia shchitaetsa chelovekom propashchim.*)[6] The emphasis on need of parental blessing and fear of disastrous consequences of parental curse is stressed in many Great-Russian folk customs and in their folk sayings, folk songs, and folk tales.[7]

Another instrument at the disposal of the father in imposing

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

IV

Ideologies and Movements

14

REVOLT OF THE LAND-OWNING INTELLIGENTSIA (WESTERNISM AND SLAVOPHILISM)

I

IN CONSEQUENCE of the reforms of Peter the Great the dvorianstvo obtained hereditary rights on their lands. At the same time their service to the state ceased to be obligatory. But the traditions of this class consisted of warfare and ruling, not of land cultivation. Thus when this newly formed landed gentry did not have to serve the state, many of them became a leisure class of people who occupied themselves by visiting Western lands, cultivating Western languages and fine arts and studying Western political and social ideologies. Few among these people were inclined to retire to the country and dedicate themselves to the management of their estates. The result of such a trend of events was that a large part of this leisure class people Europeanized themselves and developed high educational and intellectual standards. And it was from this group of a well educated landed gentry who were losing their

6: Tomatic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[565] 517 668 former role as main instruments of the Czar's power to a parvenu bureaucracy and military that leaders of first opposition movements were recruited.

Even before and during the French Revolution a number of Russian landed nobility became aware of the ideas of the Revolution. They were also becoming increasingly interested in constitutional forms of government in which they could take part in their own right, not depending upon the whims of a despotic monarch. Some of these people even became dissatisfied with serfdom because of its economic inefficiency. They were also becoming increasingly impatient with absolutism because of its oppressive and degrading aspects.

[701] Such ideas and feelings penetrated the officers' corps and a number of this military intelligentsia organized themselves into a secret society and formulated a concrete program for constitutional changes.[1] Some of these people came from high nobility. Others, especially those from the South, were impoverished nobles living on meager officer's salaries. In December, 1825 [669] these people attempted to seize power. However, owing to ideological differences and the traditional factional splits within the dvorianstvo, the attempt of this faction of military intelligentsia to gain power was thwarted.[2] Nevertheless, this uprising of the "Decembrists," though abortive, was the beginning of increasing revolutionary activities of the intelligentsia[3] which finally brought about the overthrow of the Czardom in the Revolution of 1917.

[642] 517 177 The revolt of the Decembrists was a sign that the Czardom had already gone through such changes in its social structure that a change in its political system was overdue. The most important change in this structure was the formation of a class which, for the first time in Russia's history, became economically independent of the Czar, and which, though economically idle and not always prosperous, became intellectually very alert and also very sensitive to Western ideas.

In accordance with the traditional behavior pattern of Russian nobility, their reactions to the conditions at home and to Western thought tended to develop in the direction of two opposite extremes. One was that of the "Westerners" who were

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

lead the others. Russia was therefore predestined to fulfill this world mission. Hence the Pan-Slavs looked to Moscow, the ancient Russian capital, not the Westernized "City of Peter" (Petersburg) as the heart of Russia[17] and of mankind of the future—the Third Rome.

15
REVOLT OF THE RAZNOCHINTSY INTELLIGENTSIA (NIHILISM AND ANARCHISM)

I

BY THE second part of the nineteenth century, new changes were taking place in the economic relations as well as in the political and class structure of the Czardom. First of all, the process of disintegration of the old order under the impact of the industrialization and bureaucratization was rapidly coming to an end. Serfdom was abolished and with it there came the disastrous ruin of manorial estates which were not prepared to cope with the difficulties of a money and market economy. The result was that the number of impoverished and pauperized gentry was greatly increased.

At the same time the new laws tended to place emphasis on property. Thus, for instance, in the local assemblies of the noblemen the elective franchise was granted only to noblemen possessing a certain amount of land or a certain value of industrial establishment. This difference in civil rights according to the amount of property introduced a sharp cleavage into the gentry class. Earlier all dvorianstvo and all chinovnichestvo were considered equal in rights and had at least theoretically an equal chance to rise in power or to win the favor of the Czar. But now the new laws disfranchised and declassed a large part of the gentry. Similar laws favored the richer class among the merchants which meant that even in municipal affairs birth and education decreased in value in comparison with wealth.[1]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

178 In the new secularized and urbanized society, also, the position
● 565 of the clergy became increasingly precarious. Like other insti-
793 tutions of the Czardom the Russian Orthodox Church was organized along the lines of sharp social differentiation and dominance-submission relationships. Russian Orthodox clergy as a whole formed a closed caste institution. All lay clergymen and many monastics were recruited from among the members of the
[582] families of lay clergy. Endogamous marriage was practiced within this caste. The church maintained its own schools for both the sons and the daughters of clergymen. In this manner
[184] the clergy had been separated from the rest of the society and had developed a sub-culture of its own. The clerics were set apart from others not only by their priestly garb, but by their manners, and even by their names.

792 Internally, however, within the ranks of the Orthodox clergy
793 there was a sharp distinction between the monastic order (black
554 clergy) and the secular priesthood (white clergy). The monastic order was rich in land donations and other possessions and all the Church hierarchy was recruited from among its ranks. The secular clergy was not only subordinate to the monastics, but also poor. Among the secular clergy sharp class distinction existed between the city clergy and the village priests. This differentiation was manifested in the differences in income, education and prestige, as well as in the lack of intermarriage between these strata. The difference was also reflected in the attitudes of
[369] the laity. While the city clergy were socially accepted by the middle and lower urban layers, the village priests were rather isolated from the rest of the population.

However, the sharpest difference and social distance existed between the Church hierarchy and the rank-and-file clergymen. The heads of monasteries, for instance, behaved like real magnates. They took in large revenues, kept servants, horses and carriages, and hardly shared in the life of their monastic brothers, even though these Church dignitaries resided in monasteries. In the same way, the bishops were inclined to belittle the lay clergy under their control. They treated them with a great want of respect. They would abuse them, insult them and then even flog them.

3/1 [i.e. developing in the second half of the XIX th century — Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

668 In a similar manner revolt was brewing in the bureaucracy
647 and the armed forces. In a system which was founded on the
701 principles of absolute dominance, subservience and uncondi-
554 tional submission, it is to be expected that the civil service employees as well as many officers would be often exposed to caprice, arbitrariness and wrong doings on the part of their superiors. These, too, were left without possibility of redress as were the clergymen. Strong sense of rank and social distance were as marked in these strata as among the clergy.

871 The lay schools[1] were not much different in strictness and dis-
● 565 cipline from the priests' seminaries, and students in these schools were often as ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, and as exposed to the rod and other degrading treatment. The student's parents, who were often impoverished gentry, petty chinovniks, or small traders with meager incomes and big families, were not always able to support their children throughout long years of schooling. At the same time in an economically and technologically
[555] undeveloped society with strong traditions of service nobility, there was nothing that young people from such families could do but to enroll at a university or a military academy in order to obtain government office, or to engage in free learned professions. In Russian society of those days these were the only possibilities of obtaining positions of some prestige. Many of these students from impoverished strata had therefore to depend upon public or private munificence to finish their studies. Some of them became police informers to secure a meager income and to finish schooling. Many had to drop out of school because of lack of financial resources.

871 All Russian schools, therefore, on the middle as well as on the
668 university level, became centers of revolt against an order which exposed them to humiliating treatment, but did not offer them opportunities in accordance with the established traditions of higher classes. Hence the higher the school, the more it was imbued with the revolutionary spirit. And the words "student" and "revolutionary" became synonymous.

517 When new laws were introduced and these ambitious and
647 rebellious young men and women finally entered state service
641 they found that in addition to being ill-treated and ill-paid, a

1 [i.e. in the second half of the XIX th century -- Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

large part of them were disfranchised as well, because in municipal self-government and in district and provincial assemblies even persons holding university degrees, if they did not own a sufficient amount of property, were devoid of the right of suffrage.[4] And it was this underprivileged group of declassee nobility, of priests' sons, of former clerics, of sons and daughters of lower government employees, of unemployed professionals, of students and of former students who never had a chance to finish their studies, that became known as the *raznochintsy*.

The raznochintsy intelligentsia tended to lead a bohemian life and to engage in literary activities and journalism. But these vocations were greatly limited because of strict censorship laws. When the bar was established some raznochintsy practiced law as barristers, though they were very restricted in their activities because of traditional extra legal practices of the police. When under local self-administration (*Zemstvo*), a health, educational, and economic program for the improvement of rural areas was developed, a number of raznochintsy were employed by the Zemstvo as physicians, veterinarians, agronomists, teachers and bookkeepers. At the same time, their traditions and training, and especially their ambitions and expectations had conditioned the raznochintsy for intellectual pursuits and political leadership, not for routine administrative work or for business promotion and enterprise.

In such a situation the deeply rooted feeling of rejection which had been developed on the family level was greatly magnified.[5] Accordingly, self-centeredness, power-seeking, lack of trust, destructive aggression, as well as identification with suffering which were developed on the family level were heightened in these circumstances and found expression in ideologies which manifested extreme hostility and an urge for universal destruction. Many of these young rebels, for instance, denied all existing social institutions, conventions and restrictions, and demanded their total obliteration.

This ideology of extreme negation and destruction ("Nihilism") manifested, perhaps, the feelings of utter despair of the ambitious and self-seeking raznochintsy who felt impotent before the God-like power of the Czar and his omnipotent police.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

revolutionary organizations was approved whenever such an act was considered necessary to strike terror into the hearts of the followers or to knit them more closely together.[23] Equally good was considered to be the method of deception, not only of the public, but also of the followers. Moreover, in order to achieve revolution and destroy the existing order, it was considered necessary to increase the existing evils. "The society will use all its resources to increase and intensify the evils and miseries of the people . . ."[24] so that the people would lose patience and be stimulated to a mass rising.

III

The extent to which Nihilist and Anarchist ideas had penetrated into various strata of Russian society by the middle of the second part of the nineteenth century may be indicated by the police records revealed during the many trials of Anarchists and Terrorists. Thus in a trial of a group known as the "Nechaevtsy," out of approximately 150 conspirators, about 30 of them or 20% were classified as nobles, about 50 or 33% of the accused were classified as students and former students. About 20 or 13% were sons of priests and divinity students. About 40 or 26% belonged to the class of bureaucrats and the military. About 15 or 10% belonged to the class of merchants and petty traders. There were five peasants, one artisan and one janitor in the group. There were also about ten women, married and single. The overwhelming majority of the conspirators were between 20 and 26 years of age, the median age being 22.[25]

As a result of Anarchist propaganda and agitation a number of secret revolutionary groups were organized and became known collectively as *podpolie* (underground).[26] One of them was *Zemlya i Volya* (land and freedom), organized in the early seventies. This society split a few years later into two factions, a moderate one, and an openly terroristic group known as the *Narodnaya Volya* (the people's will).[27] The *Narodovoltsy* initiated a series of terroristic acts and assassinations of high officials, including a number of attempts on the life of Czar Alexander II.[28]

The Czarist police fought back with the same weapons. The

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

written or by customary rules of conduct and often exposed to the arbitrariness and mistreatment of their lords, the serfs on many manorial estates came to be completely dependent upon the will and capriciousness of their masters.

It is obvious that many landed gentry who were given such absolute rights over their serfs would tend to completely subjugate the mir also. In such circumstances the mir was likely to lose its character of a self-ruled and self-contained community and instead tended to become an instrument of landlord's power which made the landowner the absolute monarch of his estate. Under the overlordship of the estate owner the mir kept its watchful eye over every peasant, and made it easier for the landowner to manage his property, and for the government to rule the country. It was under such external pressures that the steppe traditions of an absolute, stern and distant patriarchal power were being strengthened among the peasantry.

II

The conditions of the peasants did not improve in these respects after the abolishment of serfdom in the second part of the nineteenth century.[5] The peasants were emancipated from the rule of the pomeshchiks and subjected again directly to the government. But now the government, pushed by pressing demands for increasing revenues, made the mir an instrument of state control and found in it one of the most exacting of tax collectors. In order to be assured of payment the state had to concede to the mir all of the most severe measures of authority. Now the mir was entitled to banish unsolvent peasants to Siberia. And when corporal punishment was abolished in urban criminal law practice, it was still left in use in the mir.[6]

After the abolishment of serfdom the mir came under the supervision of the district chief of police (*Ispravnik*). The law of 1874 gave the police the right to arrest and to fine the village elders, and even to demand from the governor of the province their discharge. The position of the elder became so undesirable that the mir sometimes had to exert force to obtain candidates for this office or to prevent those in office from resigning.[7]

There was another official in this system of rural administra-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

There was another official in this system of rural administration, the *pisar*, who, though only a salaried clerk, with no executive authority, frequently exerted great influence. He was usually a stranger to the commune because of his urban manners and dress. He might be a former divinity student, an army veteran, or a city clerk dismissed for inefficiency. He was ill paid as a commune clerk and inclined to make up for his low salary by accepting bribes.[8] But the real power in the village was often vested in the hands of the *uryadnik*, the village constable, who had manifold duties and many prerogatives. He tended to consider himself as Czar of the village and was inclined to be arbitrary and insolent. He often terrorized the peasants and "the government protected him in his practices, even to the point of prohibiting the newspapers from printing accounts of outrages he perpetrated."[9]

In the meantime other structural changes were taking place in the Russian village. Since earlier the landlords and now the government relied on a few peasants who controlled the mir, these often took advantage of their privileged position and tended to beguile the commune out of its best lands. Some of these people also owned taverns (*kabak*) and were money lenders and usurers. They tended to ape their masters, kept at a certain distance from other peasants and looked down upon them. Because of their greediness, misuse of power, and contemptuous attitude toward the peasants, they became known among the peasants as *miroedy* (mir-eaters) and as *kulaki* (fists).[10]

According to the established custom the decisions in the village assembly were arrived at unanimously and by acclamation. If there was a minority opinion the minority was expected to expressly or tacitly accept the view of the majority. In the Old-Slavonic village community and in the mir before serfdom a genuine unanimity rule was possible because that community was on the whole undifferentiated economically or socially, and was governed to a large extent by public consensus. But as soon as this rural community became stratified, the unanimity principle was exploited to the advantage of the dominant cliques. When serfdom was established, the unanimity principle was often employed to support the decisions and the whims of the landlords. And after emancipation, the police or an oligarchy of

[i.e. after the abolition of serfdom -- Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

623 a few kulaks were often able to force the commune members into unanimous decision by means of threats or bribing. And there was no appeal against such decisions.

565 621 154 In such circumstances many land communes tended to lose their former equalitarian and protective aspects and the peasants came to fear the mir and to feel an awe before it as much as they had a fear and awe before God and the Czar or before a stern and distant father. They feared the overwhelming power of the mir, the finality of its decision, and the lack of redress against its will They tended to identify the mir's final power with that of Almighty God. "There is no court for the mir, one God is its judge," they would say. Feeling helpless in the front of such an [156] uncontrollable power, there seemed to be nothing else for the peasants to do but to submit to its will. "One cannot argue with the mir"; "Mir will stand for itself, you cannot go against it" they would say. And since there was no other way out for one but to be a part of such an overwhelming and capricious institution the most expedient way of behavior for him was to accept it and to do as the others do. "Although bad, you cannot do without it"; "If you have to live with wolves you might as well howl as they do."[11]

621 625 156 The mir and police were empowered to interfere not only in the system of planting, sowing, and harvesting, but in family and personal affairs as well. The problems of paternal authority and filial duties, the relations between husband and wife, and between in-laws, the questions of inheritance, military conscription, and general behavior, all were within the grasp of these village authorities.[12] Just as in his own family, the rank-and-file individual was completely lost in his village commune. A rank-and-file man had the right to participate in the debates and was expected to vote unanimously for the regulations which restricted his personal and his economic freedom. He who dared to object was unprotected against the despotism and arbitrariness either of the ruling minority or of an incited mob. Thus the feelings of complete dependence upon superior powers prevailed in the community.

241 In addition, poor quality of land, lack of sufficient moisture, long and hard winters, many years of military service, low

6; Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

standards of formal education, low level of agricultural technology, undeveloped means of transportation and too many idle days handicapped the advance of agriculture. In such circumstances the peasants did not even produce sufficient food to nourish themselves, much less a surplus to exchange for manufactured products. As a consequence the peasants were exposed to periodical famines during which many died of starvation.

Periodical epidemics of cholera, typhus, small pox, and other diseases took a toll as high as famines. A low degree of personal hygiene in crowded living conditions also increased the death rate. In addition there was a great dearth of doctors, nurses and hospitals, and no measures of preventive medicine. Equally ruinous were the periodical cattle epidemics due to primitive techniques of cattle raising. One should add to these misfortunes the figure of more than one hundred thousand peasant homes destroyed each summer by fires, many of them the result of arson. And if one considers the widely spread robbery, theft and murder that went undetected and unpunished, one gets an idea of the distressing personal and social conditions in which the Russian peasant lived. It was in such circumstances, left entirely to his own resources, that he developed an ideological, emotional and symbolical world of his own.

17
THE ATTITUDES OF THE PEASANTRY

I

STUNNED by the magnitude of the inimical and arbitrary social and physical forces which surrounded him and completely controlled his life, the Great-Russian peasant felt impotent and helpless. In the family circle if he had to be submissive and he was exposed to arbitrariness of the elder, he also might have enjoyed a certain degree of protection and succor.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Outside the family, however, this system of social relationships tended to lose its protection-dependence character and to emphasize domineering-subservience attitudes in complete contrast to the traditions of and his yearning for an equalitarian and protective folk community that had existed in the past.

In such circumstances his sense of rejection and his demand for acceptance which he might have experienced in the family were reinforced and magnified, affecting his whole view of life, his attitudes toward the world around him and his image of the universe. He was convinced that there was no justice in the world and that there was nobody to whom he could appeal for redress. "Injustice and untruth rule the world"; "Injustice and untruth started with the world and will end with the world," he would say.[1]

In such circumstances the peasant was inclined to see the wrathful, the revengeful, and the implacable aspect of God, especially since such image of a Christian God had support in the teachings of the Russian Orthodoxy. Accordingly the peasant visioned the saints who surrounded the Old Man as quarrelling among themselves and bragging about their strength and achievements and as being vindictive, cheating, and playing tricks on one another.[2] Since the peasant pictured Christ as being only the son of a wrathful Father, he could not depend upon him according to the Russian view of patriarchal family relationships. The Russian peasant therefore had a "sympathetic but detached view of Christ."[3]

The peasant's feeling of rejection in regard to God was manifested in his lack of assurance as to the help he could expect from Him. God, to whom he prayed, seldom interfered on his behalf against earthly authorities. And though "All power was from God," the peasant knew that "God gives power to whom he wants to." The peasant was therefore at times openly resentful of God's neglect. "God neither lets you live nor die," he would say. In his despair he was inclined to believe that there were other forces, beside God, which ruled the universe, such as the Devil who was looked upon as "the junior brother of God and his carpenter in the creation of the universe."[4] And, not unlike Asiatic steppe herders who lived in similar circumstances, the

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Great-Russian peasant saw the need to keep on good terms with this ruler of the underworld.

Since the Czar was identified with God, the peasant's feeling toward the Czar was like his attitude toward God. He knew that the Czar was as omnipotent as God. "Everything is in the power of God and the Czar," he would say. Therefore, he feared the Czar like he feared God, he felt an awe before the Czar as before God, and he hoped for the best, but it can hardly be said that he had much love for him. "Czar is not fire, but if you come close to him you will burn yourself," he would say. His idea was also that "Where there is Czar there is fear and dread," and that "Czar's rage spreads death." Since God was so far away, detached, neglectful, and implacable, it was the Czar's fearful power that mattered. "God's is the will, but the court is Czar's," he would say.[5]

The peasant's feelings toward the supreme power of the world and of the universe reflected only his bitter experiences with the representatives of these powers on the earth with whom he had to deal in local affairs. Often these did not bring justice, but venality, arbitrariness and persecution. "The court is founded on untruth and injustice"; "Where there is court there is chicanery," he would say. And since the judges were corrupted, the only way to get anything from them was to bribe them. "The judge is useful as much as the pocket is helpful," he would say. Such action, however, was not always advisable because of greediness of the judges. "You will never fill a judge's pocket"; "Do not litigate, you will strangle yourself."[6]

Because of his traditional distrust of authorities the peasant showed also a profound lack of trust in all written laws. He likened the law to the cobweb whose purpose was to catch the small and helpless, not the big and powerful ("The bumblebee will break through, the fly will get stuck."). He also compared the law to a tool that could be used arbitrarily by those who held it in their hands ("The law is like shaft, you turn it wherever you want it."). He noticed that "those who write the laws also break them," and concluded that "It is in vain to write laws if they are not carried out." In accordance with the Old-Slavonic anarchic and equalitarian traditions he was inclined to believe

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

that "If all laws perished the people would live in truth and justice."[7]

The peasant realized that there was sharp differentiation in economic status in his society as well as in his own local community. But what he especially resented was that the men of wealth took advantage of their position to oppress the weak; and that the poor had to be utterly submissive and subservient to the well-to-do. "The one who is better off has long hands," the peasants would say, meaning that the men of wealth had control over others. And he would compare the arbitrariness of the man of power with the craftsman who handles his material according to his will. "The master is like the carpenter: he cuts the way it pleases him." He would also say that the rich man has all the space he wants "as much as the pike in the water," but as "for the poor there is nowhere any room." He resented the fact that though "Poverty was not sin, yet the people laughed at it." He also objected that the poor were forced to repress their real feelings and cringe before the rich. "The poor are angry at the rich, yet they find themselves in their trail with cap in hand," he would complain.[8]

The peasant therefore grew distrustful and resentful of everyone who was in one way or other above him. He could not depend much upon God and Czar, and he mistrusted the bureaucrats, the landlords, the priests, the judges, the police, and even the better-off people of his own strata. He was particularly distrustful of cities and city folk, of Moscow and Moscovites especially. From ancient times he looked upon Moscow, the seat of the Czar's government, as heartless and deceitful, and as the source of most of his troubles. "In Moscow," he thought, "you find everything except own father and mother." He also considered that his capital city was so corrupted that, "If you go to Moscow you must take there your last penny."

The peasant therefore lived in an environment in which he felt deserted by the powers of heaven and oppressed by their representatives on earth. He therefore felt unprotected, isolated, friendless, lonely, and insecure. His idea was that both God and man were against him. "If God attacks you, good people will attack you too," he would complain.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

The peasant therefore appraised the social environment in which he lived as dominated by powerful destructive forces which were capricious, neglectful and inimical but upon which he was completely dependent for his life and livelihood. He strongly resented these powers and wished he could destroy them, but felt helpless before them. He therefore projected his feelings of helplessness as well as his destructive urges into the supernatural world and proceeded to inhabit that world with all-powerful, arbitrary, and vicious beings which sought the annihilation of man, and of the earth.

II

On the family level in similar circumstances, two contrasting tendencies, that of complete submission to the parental power and that of rebellion against it are likely to be formed. In a like manner submission and rebellion characterized the behavior of the Russian peasantry on the local community level. The peasant was inclined to appear servile and docile toward all authorities. He would address every one of his superiors as "Father" (*batyushka*). He would bow low (*klanyatsya v poyas*) or in twain (*klanyatsya v nogi*) before them. Before the Czar he would prostrate himself (*chelobitye*) and if the Czar was passing by he would fall on his knees and cross himself. All he could hope for was that by offering unconditional obedience or by propitiating the powers that be, he would be spared. And if all this appeasing of the authorities were in vain he would refrain from revolt as long as he realized that he was utterly helpless and without support in the front of overwhelming powers. In such circumstances he tended to become completely resigned and fatalistic. He might arrive at the conclusion that "You cannot run away from fate, not even on horse-back," and that "Unto each man happens what was decreed at his birth."[9]

With such a frame of mind the Russian peasant was ready to accept great suffering without much complaint. "Misfortune is like the ocean: neither you can swim across it nor can you draw it out," he would say. "And who is it that was not visited by misfortune and misery?" he would ask. Therefore since "You cannot escape misery," "Do not struggle with misery, but suffer"

6. Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF: Great Russia RF1

565 154 [761] (*S bedoyu ne perekoryaisya, terpi!*). And then if life is all suffering, why be afraid of death, he would ask himself. "Be afraid to live, do not be afraid to die! To live is more terrible than to die"; "We do not rejoice in life, but in death."[10]

565 785 788 Identification with suffering and preoccupation with death which has been conditioned by family experiences and reinforced on the community level led the Russian peasants to practice long and hard fasts, and to undertake difficult pilgrimages to far off places of worship. "There is only one salvation, fast and prayer"; "We don't live on bread, but on prayer" they would say. Long and hard fasting and prayer of the Great-Russian peasants were not only manifestations of his identification with suffering and his feeling of helplessness and complete dependency upon superior forces, but were perhaps also expressions of his tendency to completely retire from an unsatisfactory and an unhappy world.

792 156 The extremes of this suffering and withdrawal from the world were reached by anchorites who sought complete solitude in wild deserts "far away from men," and by those hermits who lived self-buried in the catacombs, away not only from man, but also from the light of day. Such people enjoyed among the peasants the fame of saints and were believed to possess miraculous powers. Many peasants would make vows of pilgrimage to places where such people lived self-buried, isolated and withdrawn from all human contact.

III

565 156 The peasant's complete submission to unpredictable and arbitrary forces was enhanced because of the lack of solidarity among the peasants themselves. After the peasant had been subjected to arbitrary regimentation and to permanent policing on the part of the authorities, he began to lose faith not only in the authorities but in his fellow peasants as well. Thus mistrust and suspiciousness rooted in patriarchal relations were heightened. In such circumstances the peasant became increasingly distrustful of his neighbors, tended to withdraw within his own family and to become himself ready to spy on others.[11]

In such conditions when isolated, helpless and self-oriented,

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

the peasant tended to conceive of every man as a dangerous fellow. "Ruddy or red, the man is dangerous" (*Ryzhyi da krasnyi chelovek opasnyi*), he would say. He did not think he could expect any help from man. "Do not expect any good from a human being," he would advise. And between a living man and a dead one, he thought that the latter was preferred. "No evil comes from a dead man, and no good comes from a living one," he would assert. Many Great-Russian folk sayings emphasize the need for silence, or the necessity to spare words, so that one may not betray himself and let the others take advantage of him. "Do not say every word! Do not reveal every little thought when people are near!" these maxims caution. They also warn: "Do not believe every talk, do not tell every truth!"[12]

But such a lack of faith in human beings might lead to the resolution that one is quite justified to take advantage of everyone else, since all others would do the same to him. Thus social isolation and mistrust tended to reinforce self-seeking and encourage the use of all means to achieve one's personal ends: "Lie began with the world and with the world it will die," the peasants would say. They concluded that since "Man lives by falsehood, we too should not remain behind." Their advice therefore was: "Do not mourn for truth, make terms with falsehood"; "It is by falsehood that men live."[13]

The Great-Russian peasant was accordingly often forced to rely on deliberate deceit as a means of survival in a hostile, distrustful, and unreliable world. He did not consider it necessary to have any respect for agreements, contract obligations or given pledges. He tended to be crafty even in his dealings with God and saints. When committing sinful acts at home he would cover his icons. A number of Russian folk tales are concerned with cunning and show how profitable it might be for one to resort to such means.[14] Heroes in folk epics are addicted to deceit and are condoned for their deeds of guile. Merchants in peasant villages almost invariably used false weights and measures. Perjury was so frequent that there were people whose sole profession it was to swear falsely.[15]

While in such an aggressive mood the peasant was inclined to evoke to his help the dark forces. As a result there was a great

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

demand for the witches (*vedma*) and wizards (*znakhar*), persons who dealt in black magic. One bought their services both as protection from his enemies and as a means of attack on them. In this manner the dealers in black magic who were a means of protection and attack were also an added threat in life. Some knowledge of defensive and offensive magic became therefore indispensable for everybody.

Destructive urges which developed in such conditions were manifested also in the idea that it was possible for one, if he so wished, to turn into vampire in order to bring evil upon his enemies or to suck their blood. Any wizard or witch by using a spell (*zagovor*) was able to transform a man into a vampire. Such men, transformed into ghost-beasts, would then deal their terrible blows on their enemies, slaking on their victims their thirst for blood.[16]

These same conditions fostered crime, particularly theft, robbery and murder. Some of the sayings, for instance, condone theft and even robbery, particularly if they were done cleverly and the perpetrators escaped being caught. That crime was not only a means of personal gain but also a means of protest against existing conditions is witnessed by those folk proverbs which rationalize or justify theft on the ground that those from whom it was stolen were likely to be much more guilty than the thieves themselves. "He who stole sinned once; those from whom it was stolen sinned ten times." The same motivation might be seen in the inclination to put the blame on the informers more than on the thieves. "Not he who steals, but he who leads is a thief," they would say.[17] Backed by such philosophy of life and favored by existing conditions, crime became widespread. And since in that society force was identified with law, violence was often justified as a means to secure the property of others, especially in times of war. "What is taken by force is sacred," the people would say.

Since the conditions in the patriarchal family and in the stratified local community fostered destructive aggression, and since violence was widely used by all the authorities, the peasant manifested a strong inclination toward violence, whenever this expression of his protest could go unpunished. On the family

6; Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

level violence was manifested in frequent beatings of wife and children, and on the rural community level in habitual drunkenness that often ended in brawls and even murder.[18] In conditions which foster human degradation and lack of trust, both self-seeking and vindictiveness flourish. Hence the Great-Russian peasant was inclined to commit atrocious acts of revenge against people whom he considered as his persecutors or who caused him any harm. When threatening with revenge the Great-Russian peasant was likely to say: "You will pay me with your own blood" (*Ty u menya kroviyu svoey umoeshsya*). Killing as a revenge, burning hay-ricks, barns and homes was a common occurrence. The peasants were likely to organize a collective hunt against real or fancied malefactors and mutilate them or put them to death by means of torture:

> For murder and robbery, death of the culprit—sometimes with mutilation by cutting and tearing off of various parts of his body. For horse-theft and grand larceny they practice sometimes hammering of iron nails into the head and forcing of wooden pins under the nails and also merciless beating even onto death; . . . in some instances the case ends by maiming the thief and letting him go.[19]

At the same time the frontiersmen and professional warriors, such as the Cossacks, became renowned and widely admired because of their deeds of vindictiveness and violence. War was a great opportunity for people with such inclinations. As Gogol has put it, the Cossacks found a great delight in "accumulating booty from raided towns, putting the villages and the fields on fire, and spreading their glories by far and wide throughout the steppe" in order "to revenge themselves for all evil and humiliation."[20] There were numerous robber and Cossack songs which told about such exploits, and expressed desire for vindictiveness and destructive aggression.

Destructive aggression was nursed on the patriarchal family level and reinforced by conditions in the local community. Thus as soon as the controls of the authorities would weaken, mass revolts would come into the open. Such a behavior in turn was used by the local authorities as a justification for their strictness in dealing with the peasants:

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Speaking of the character of the peasants Mr. Karnovitch observed, that whoever has to exercise authority over them must above all things guard against indecision, whether in word or act. The Russian always requires a definite command; and in disputes, if the settlement be distinct and pre-emptory, he will be satisfied, whether the sentence is favorable or unfavorable, wise or unwise. If there be hesitation, he immediately becomes intractable, while a resolute command has a magical influence which he cannot resist.[21]

In such a society which is kept together by naked force rather than by moral bonds, breakdown of controls easily results in revolt and upheavals, in widespread bloodshed and destruction. On such occasions, just like the raznochintsy intelligentsia, the peasants, too, tended to revolt against all forms of humiliation and oppressive submission and demanded reestablishment of the old community relations, in which truth and justice and equalitarian brotherhood of man prevailed.

Such forms of peasant protest, which were directed against all the authorities, the family, community elders, the landlord, the Church and the state, will be discussed on the following pages.

18
RELIGIOUS REVOLT OF THE PEASANTRY

I

THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH which in the course of its history came to be completely subjected to the state and was made an instrument of governing, supported the lay authorities in their policies of enserfment. But the state had meagerly rewarded the Church for such services. The revenues from the land donations given to the parishes by the state or by the landlords were not sufficient to maintain the parish priests and their families. The village priests therefore depended for their living upon the fees which the peasants

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

had to pay for religious services. In addition many village priests had an inferior training, were often semi-literate. and were sometimes publicly humiliated by their superiors. Abased by hard conditions of life, some of them tended to lose self-respect and sought comfort in habitual drunkenness.

In the meantime as a result of the conditions of serfdom the economic situation of the peasants was deteriorating while the village priests whose main revenues consisted of fees received for their services tended to squeeze out of the peasantry all they could. Hence in many parishes the relations between the priests and the peasants gradually developed into a state of perpetual bickering and struggle.[1] In such circumstances peasants were likely to develop a negative attitude toward the clergy. To "have a priest's eye" meant in peasant idiom to covet everything. Similar meaning was conveyed in the phrase "Am I a priest to eat two dinners?" The peasants compared the greediness of the priests to that of the judges. "A priest waits for a rich dead, and a judge for a rich litigant"; "A judge's pocket is the same as a priest's belly," they would say. It was considered a bad omen to meet a priest on the street. It must be pointed out, also, that in a situation in which any expression of opposition against the lay authorities was very risky and dangerous, the attack against the priests might have served as a convenient substitute target for destructive aggression directed against the landlords and the state.

In such conditions government ukases and police measures were sometimes necessary to force the peasants into churches; they were made to confess and to take communion by means of threat. As a result, confession and communion tended to be looked upon as a commercialized formality. It was a tedious obligation that had to be paid for in cash, the same as all other tributes and taxes to which the peasants were subjected. In such circumstances, confession and communion tended to lose their function of consolation, comfort, relief from guilt and identification with divinity. As a result a growing number of peasants ceased to look upon the priests as their friends and protectors; they tended to look upon them as government agents who conspired with the landlords and the police against the

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

peasants. Such a situation in many cases bred extreme antagonism against the priests, especially when hostility against the priests was stirred up by systematic agitation, as in the case of various sects of Dissenters (*Raskolniki*). This agitation often took the form of folk songs:

hairy ones . . . the beasts:
These beasts are the priests
They howl, like wolves. . . .

• • •

In the churches they praise the Lord hypocritically,
And ensnare innocent people with their words;
In the churches they offer glory to God,
And send the Uryadniks to hunt innocent people;

• • •

And they drive innocent people to Siberia.
In the churches they open their mouths,
But before the government they keep silent.
Their hair is long like women's,
But their brain is a great deal shorter.

• • •

They howl like beasts;

• • •

They extort from all.
Wicked hairy priests . . .[2]

• • •

The peasants were attracted to numerous sects of the Dissenters which were spreading in Russia, especially since the seventeenth century when the great movement of the Old Believers (*Starovery*) began. In these sects and their ideologies the peasants protested against the conditions of serfdom. The teachings of a number of these sects expressed yearning for a new life, and for an anarchic brotherhood of men in which nobody would be rejected and everybody accepted on equal terms. Peasant Sutayev, for instance, who founded the Sutayevtsy sect in 1880, was considered to be one of the most pious churchgoers before he revolted against the official Church. He rebelled when he was over fifty. The occasion was a dispute that he had with his parish priest over a fee for the burial of his grandson. It was after this quarrel that he stopped going to

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

19
PEASANT UPRISINGS

I

EVER since the establishment of serfdom, slaves and serfs would free themselves from oppressive bondage by joining the gangs of vagabonds, fugitives from justice, army deserters, malcontents and escapees of all kinds, many of whom lived by theft, robbery, and begging. These victims of oppression, as well as many adventurers, gathered along the frontiers of the empire in "no man's land" where they would organize themselves as bands of freebooters, guerillas, and mercenaries, ready to enter the service of rival powers.

In the regions of the lower Don and Dnieper these communities of fugitives of all social classes and occupations and of many races formed elective military governments, known as the Cossack republics. Once they were established, these free Cossack communes served as a place of attraction to all who longed for freedom from oppression or who sought adventure. In these free societies no one was asked any question about his passport, his identity, his domicile, his faith, or his belongings. Everyone willing to fight and loot was welcome, but none was forced to come or stay.[1]

However, by the middle of the seventeenth century in these Cossack commonwealths, there appeared a social differentiation between the old settlers and the newcomers. The older settlers formed a property-owning class known as the "house-owners," and the newcomers became known as the *golytba* (the naked). And it was these unsettled and restless Cossacks of the "naked class" that played an especially prominent part in the uprisings of the seventeenth century and later.[2]

The first part of the seventeenth century, known in the history of the Czardom as the "Period of Trouble," was characterized by the lack of an established authority. The old dynasty had

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ended in a violent and mysterious way and a number of pretenders arose to take its place. It was in this interval between the fall of the former authority and the relative consolidation of a new one that the oppressed strata of the Czardom saw an opportunity to rebel against a state of humiliating bondage and economic misery. Seeking relief from their burdens and yearning for social acceptance in a system of equalitarian relationships, the poorer burghers, homeless Cossacks and runaway peasants and slaves flocked into the camp of Bolotnikov, himself an ex-slave and adventurer who marched at the head of this strange army upon Moscow. From his camp near Moscow he distributed proclamations inviting slaves and serfs to slay their masters, commanding all of his followers to rise against the voevodas and others in authority, and exciting them to rob and beat traders. In return he promised the slaves and serfs the wives and the property of the serf-owners. To all his followers he pledged honors, riches and the status of boyars.[3]

Search for security in a system of protection-dependence relationships manifested itself in a need for pretenders. If only a rumor started about the appearance of a pretender, whole provinces would rise to greet him. Sometimes a pretender had to be subsequently found to lead these masses of discontents who rose to follow a fancied liberator and benefactor. Such conditions only contributed to the prolongation of the troubled times and prevented an early establishment and consolidation of a new authority. It was in such a way that most of the seventeenth century became a century of riotings and rebellions which climaxed in the great rising under Stanka Razin in 1670–1671. Originating among the Don Cossacks, this movement soon spread to the Volga regions and developed into a general war of the lower strata against the upper classes. In this, as in the other uprisings of that century, many excesses were committed by both the rebels and the government forces. The same features of social struggle were repeated in the eighteenth century, in the great peasant rebellion that was led by Pugachev, another Cossack chieftain.

Also the nineteenth century witnessed a number of peasant rebellions. In the beginning of that century the peasants of the

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

Pensa gubernia rose against the landlords with the slogan "Liberty and Land" (*Zemlya i Volya*).[4] Ever since they had been enserfed and bound to the land, the peasants kept in cherished memory the *Yuriev den*, St. George's day, the day when in earlier times each peasant was allowed to leave his landlord (*vykhod*). The peasants' demand for freedom from bondage was as strong as their demand for land. When the ideas of personal, economic and political freedoms started to penetrate Russia from the European West, also, the Russian peasants, owing to a growing contact with the city and the intelligentsia, became affected by them and in consequence revolts were increasing in number. Between 1826 and 1830 there were 41 cases of peasant rebellions and between 1858–1860 there were 284 such uprisings.[5]

It is significant to note that these peasant rebellions became especially prominent and especially widely spread each time the ruling class had suffered loss of prestige, such as in case of defeat on the battlefield. During the Crimean War in 1854 and 1855 widespread peasant uprisings took place on the shores of the Volga, and in central and southwestern gubernias, the Vladimir, Ryasan, Tambov, Pensa, and Voronezh.[6] In these provinces the mir institution prevailed and periodical redistribution of land was practiced. Here also reaction against abusive and humiliating conditions of serfdom was very intense and demand for land became very strong. In these provinces the traditions of earlier revolts were fresh in the memory of the peasantry. In addition, growing density of population and increasing land shortage tended to strengthen the revolutionary attitudes of the peasants. Their hostilities turned against the landlords whom they blamed for all their ills and misfortunes.

II

The defeat in the Crimean War and the internal disturbances which followed that war forced the Czarist government to undertake measures to reorganize its armed forces and to stabilize the regime internally. After being defeated by technologically and politically superior enemies, the Czarist government finally realized that in order to improve Russia's fighting effectiveness vis-a-vis the West, higher state revenues were needed and these

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

could be achieved only if Russia was to change radically its economic structure. As a result of such a trend of events and of thought the government passed a decree in 1861 according to which the peasants were set legally free from their masters.

As a consequence of his legal emancipation, the peasant found himself in the possession of less arable land than before, and he was still bound to it. He was overburdened even more than before because he was obliged to pay high redemption dues in addition to the heavy taxes that were imposed on him. Moreover the peasants in land communes not only remained jointly responsible to the government for the payment of taxes, but they were also made jointly responsible for redemption payments. The commune's authority over the peasants was increased and the peasant found himself under an even more exacting and more despotic commune regimentation than the one that existed before the "Emancipation Act."

At the same time the peasant still did not have sufficient arable land. He also lacked pasture grounds and timber which were of special importance in his technologically backward and extensive agricultural economy; most of such land was left in the hands of his former masters. The acuteness of land shortage was especially felt because of lack of artificial fertilizers, need for draught animals, and primitiveness of farm equipment. Many peasants did not even possess a wooden plow.

But though the emancipation act of 1861 still kept the peasants bound to the land, and did not provide them with sufficient land, it did open up opportunities for their economic advance and political activation. By the latter part of the nineteenth century, the peasantry became generally recognized as a potentially very significant force, both politically and economically. It was this prospect of the peasant masses as the leading political power of the future in combination with the Slavophil idealization of the peasantry that gave rise to the ideology of *narodnichestvo* (populism). This ideology idealized the virtues and the creative potentialities of the peasantry, and just as the Slavophils, the narodniki claimed that the reconstruction of Russian society, even of the whole world, will come from Russian peasantry.

By the end of that century a faction of Russian radical intel-

By the end of that century[1] a faction of Russian radical intel- 668
ligentsia fused the Russian Narodnik and Anarchist ideologies 517
and practices with those of Western Socialism and formed the 665
Party of Socialist Revolutionaries. The program of this Party [177]
was agrarian socialism and terrorism. They published leaflets and manifestos, and spread their ideas in the villages. The Socialist Revolutionaries preached open violence as a means of overthrowing the Czarist regime. They relied on the peasantry to start uprisings against the landlords and government officials, and to commit individual acts of terror to achieve their ends. Just as earlier, the Anarchists and Terrorists, the Party of Socialist Revolutionaries, had a separate organization which specialized in perpetrating acts of terror:

> Where the lash and the whip are, there are also the bomb and the revolver! So has it been, so is it now, and so shall it be. When public indignation and hate become centered upon an agent of the regime whether he be placed high or low; when that agent becomes a symbol of violence and despotism; when his activity becomes harmful to the commonweal; when no means are available to render him harmless and his continued existence represents an affront to the social conscience, then is the door open to terror in the executor of the sentence pressed from the hearts of public-minded citizens.[7]

The terroristic organization of the Party of Socialist Revolu- 665
tionaries enjoyed complete autonomy within the Party. It had its 668
own sources of revenue and was independent in selection of prospective victims. In the course of a few years of its existence it perpetrated more than two hundred acts of terror. Most of these consisted of assassinations or of attempted assassinations of highly placed officials of the government, including a member of the Imperial Family, two Ministers of Interior, thirty-nine governors, seventy-four ranking officers of the army and the navy, and fifty-two high police officials. Seventy percent of these acts of terror were perpetrated by workers, peasants, soldiers and sailors.[8]

The Socialist Revolutionaries relied mainly on middle and 665
poor peasant strata. They attempted to widen the gap between 565 ●
the better-off and the poor, to set up the lowest strata against the 668
upper, to stir class hatred against the kulaks. In their manifestos, leaflets, and speeches, the Socialist Revolutionaries harangued

[1] [i.e. 19th century — Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

665 565 668 the peasantry, and appealed to their deeply rooted hostilities against the ruling classes, and against all people of means. In their proclamations to the peasantry they stated that "the land belongs to those who till it." They incited the peasants to appropriate by force hay, pasture, and timber. They also encouraged violence and murder against all those whom they held responsible for their plight.[9]

[579] As a result of such propaganda and agitation combined with economic and social difficulties, peasant disturbances were renewed and increased in frequency and intensity. They led to the events of 1905. That year the government suffered a considerable [727] loss of prestige because of the defeat on the battlefield (the Japanese War of 1904–1905). In such circumstances (the same as after the Crimean War), fear and awe and unconditional obedience—the foundations of Czarist rule—were shaken, internal disturbances ensued and threatened the existence of the Czardom. By this time the revolutionary eruptions of the peasantry were combined with those of the industrial proletariat. Between [468] January and April, 1905, there were about 660,000 workers on economic and political strikes.[10] In October of the same year there was again a general strike.

In that month also a general peasant rising took place embracing three hundred districts in 47 gubernias. Again it was the central and southern regions that took the lead;[11] and again the gubernias in which the landlords suffered the heaviest losses were predominantly those where the system of repartitional land tenure prevailed over the system of individual peasant households and of hereditary holdings. In the communities with communal land holdings the dissatisfaction was greatest and violence ran especially high.

665 668 The activities of the Social Revolutionaries in the village were joined by those of the Bolsheviks. By the beginning of the twentieth century a wing of the Russian Social Democratic Party, the Bolsheviks, who earlier scorned the peasants and worked exclusively among the urban proletariat, began to pay more attention to the Russian village. They became impressed by the frequency and the intensity of the peasants' disturbances and realized that the peasantry presented potentially very ex-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

plosive revolutionary material. Hence the Bolsheviks began to send their agitators into the village.

There was no tendency among these extremists and maximalists to make use of peaceful means which had now been made possible by the Czar's Manifesto of October, 1905. In this manifesto legislative powers were given to Duma (house of representatives) and a certain degree of political, cultural and personal freedom was introduced. On the contrary these professional conspirators, following Anarchist precepts and practices, took advantage of increased opportunities for political agitation. That year the Socialist Revolutionaries in one of their proclamations stated: "If you need more land, hay, pasture, timber, take it from the landlord. Do not pay taxes. Drive evil priests out of the villages, boycott the courts, replace bad officials by good, throw out the police!"[12] In the same year the Bolsheviks, struck by the increasing restlessness in the village, called upon the peasants and the village proletariat for a "collective refusal to pay taxes, refusal to furnish recruits, refusal to fulfill the orders and commands of the government and its agents."[13]

III

Such revolutionary ideas which were infiltrating the villages not only confirmed the peasants in their beliefs and dispositions; they also tended to promote their feelings of rebelliousness, to radicalize them in the extreme, and push them toward excesses. In common with most tillers of land, the Russian peasants were convinced that the land by "natural right" belonged only to those who cultivate it, and that somehow, sometimes in the past, the land was taken away from them by force and trickery, not by right and justice.

The question of ownership of land was closely related to humiliating subservience to the landlords, the commune and the state. Ownership of land meant the regaining of self-respect. The peasants were therefore inclined to believe that they never lost the right to the land and that someday, somehow, all the land would have to be given back to them. "We are yours, but the land is ours" (*My vashi a zemlya nasha*), the peasants would say to the pomeshchiks. The speeches of the peasants' deputies

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

565 The speeches of the peasants' deputies
423 in the second Duma unmistakably show that the peasants con-
[446] sidered that the land belonged to them and to nobody else and that the times of degrading oppression were over. They declared themselves in favor of the free distribution of all the land that was in the possession of the nobility, the Church, and the state:

> We are talking of land these days as of nothing else. We are told it is a sacred, inviolate possession. I think if the people want it, there can be no inviolateness about it. Gentlemen of the nobility! You think we have forgotten the time when you used us as stakes in playing at cards and exchanged us for dogs! We know we were your sacred inviolate property. But the land has been stolen from us. The peasants who have sent me here have said that the land is ours! We have come here not to buy but to take it.[14]

169 Because of such beliefs and ideas which were intensified by
565 systematic revolutionary propaganda of professional conspirators
425 and agitators, any rumors concerning the land always found a
627 ready response among the peasantry. It is for the same reason that often only a vague rumor about a government land decree was sufficient to convince the peasants that the land was given back to them by the Czar, but that it was the lesser government officials, bribed by the landlords, who kept the land out of their hands. Such land-hungry peasants, already inclined to rebel against age-long and humiliating dependency, were ready to take the law into their own hands, to seize the manorial lands, to loot the estates and to kill the landlords whenever they felt that the power of the existing authorities was crumbling.

178 The professional conspirators among the Russian revolution-
565 ary intelligentsia took full advantage of such inclinations. Their revolutionary plans were especially favored by the growing differentiation in the Russian villages. In the first decade of the twentieth century economic and social differentiation in the Great-Russian village was already well advanced. It was favored by a series of government measures (Stolypin reforms)[15] which were aimed at developing a stratum of independent and prosperous peasantry and destroying the system of communal landholding. As a result of such measures the Great-Russian village became by the first decade of this century composed of a number

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

of strata, whose interests were often conflicting. There were the *obshchiniki* (the communal landholders), the *otrubniki* (the peasant private property owners), the *khutoriane* (isolated homestead owners), the *bednyaki* (the poor and indebted peasants), the *serednyaki* (the middle peasants), and the *kulaki*. Finally, there were still the pomeshchiki who owned manorial estates with arable lands, timber-forests and pasture grounds. These were, however, gradually selling their land to the better-off peasants.

The peasant private landholders prospered better than those in the communes. The yield per acre on communal lands has always been much lower than on the private lands. The communal landholders had to rely for a part of their income on wages. These they got as seasonal industrial workers or as agricultural laborers on the lands of the landed gentry. They also worked on the lands of better-off individual peasant property owners whom they resented and called *"novye pomeshchiki"* (the new squires). The poor, landless, and indebted peasants antagonized the better-off peasants. The lower and the middle peasants resented the kulaks and the pomeshchiki.

At the same time the individualization of the Great-Russian peasantry was proceeding very slowly in spite of government help and encouragement. By 1912 the proportion of consolidated peasant holdings, as compared to those remaining in the communal system, was less than 11 percent. Between 1907 and 1915 only about 20 percent of the peasants left land commune.[16] This slow decommunalization did not, however, indicate lack of desire for private land ownership. The reasons for the persistence of the old communal land system lay in the shortage of land, in peasant poverty, in vested interests within the village commune, and finally in traditional lack of self-reliance among the peasants.

As long as a large part of the Great-Russian peasantry remained in the system of communal landholding where lack of initiative and primitive techniques of cultivation prevailed, no great general improvement in land cultivation and in the standard of living of the peasantry could have been expected in spite of all government efforts. Thus, economically insecure and

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

665 tion which had developed in Russia after the February revolution and to achieve their main objective.

II

182 Just as earlier, in Turco-Mongol empires, the great weakness of the Czardom lay in its low degree of emotional and ideological unity And it is this basic vulnerability of the Czardom which has enabled a small, but determined, well disciplined and ruthless faction of professional conspirators to seize power. Like its patriarchal family the whole Czardom was torn by internal dissension and strife. The abusive and humiliating power relationships at all levels of social organization of the Czardom encouraged self-orientation and destructive aggressiveness which precluded tolerance, compromise and social cohesion.

In such circumstances it was difficult to develop a set of common values that would serve as a focal point of unity of all subjects and keep the society unified in face of all threats to its existence. Orthodox religion, as well as Russian nationalism, failed in its role of unifying ideologies in a society in which interpersonal and intergroup relationships provoked feelings of rejection, mistrust, emotional instability and extreme factionalism. Thus, instead of developing itself into an integrated community unified by common feelings and identification and common interests, there grew within the Czardom a number of separate and inimical worlds with confiicting expectations and demands and with differing images and visions.

184 There was the world of the peasants, the world of the landlords, 565 the world of the lower urban folk, the world of the clergy, the world of the bureaucracy, the world of the military, the world of the intelligentsia, the world of a small upper commercial and industrial class, and finally the separate worlds of ethnical, religious and national minorities. Since Russia had not developed a numerically strong and influential middle class to link and unify all these strata, there was little contact, less understanding and no mutual sympathy between these contrasting worlds. There were deep tensions and conflicts also within each one of these worlds and all were in a perpetual state of hostility and warfare among themselves.[11]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

The landed gentry had for ages kept the peasants in slavery, misery and contempt. The peasants, feeling humiliated and wronged, had risen against the landlords, burning manorial mansions, looting estates, and massacring their masters whenever the power of the nobility appeared to be waning. Since the traditions of Russian landed squires were those of service nobility, not of manorial aristocrats, their interests and ambitions did not prepare them to take a personal interest in either their lands or serfs. The mansions on the estates of these rural gentry were located on the outskirts of the peasant villages and except for the house servants there was little if any contact with the world of the peasantry. Since Peter the Great the differences between these two worlds became also very visible in dress, manners, standard of living, as well as in views of life, education, ideas and morals. When, after the reforms of Peter the Great, French ways were aped by the dvorianstvo, and French language accepted by them as a means of social intercourse, the abyss between the two worlds became even more unbridgeable.

Similarly the bureaucracy and the revolutionary intelligentsia were two violently opposed camps with little possibility of cooperation between them. And while secondary schools and the universities were producing increasing numbers of lawyers, teachers, architects, journalists, artists, and literati, the tension between the bureaucracy and these intelligentsia developed into an intense and open enmity. Extreme emotionalism nursed on the family level was only heightened in such conditions. Each of these groups therefore showed a great deal of dogmatism; they tended to be implacable, irreconcilable, and full of malevolent criticism of each other. To the revolutionary intelligentsia the bureaucrats were the "corrupted lackeys of the dynasts to be killed like beasts." To the government officials all the liberal intelligentsia were the "mortal enemies" of the Czar. They represented the "sedition" and had to be "mercilessly annihilated."[12] Thus while the intelligentsia relentlessly attacked the bureaucracy in a spirit of destructive criticism, the bureaucracy responded by persecuting the liberals and the revolutionaries with such a blind passion and hatred that the opposition had to go underground or emigrate abroad and organize its war from out-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

side. The gulf between these two leading groups of the Czardom became impassable.

The intelligentsia themselves were far from being unified or having a common purpose. They were a restless and unstable crowd. They were split into numerous parties, factions and cliques which were in a perpetual state of feuding and warfare among themselves. Since all tended toward extremes and all sought absolute power, each party, faction, and clique considered itself to be the only repository of the Truth and therefore anathematized all others. Dogmatic intolerance and neverending feuding constantly fostered new schisms and heresies, new renegations and treacheries, bitterness, hostilities and extreme factional strife.

Both the peasants and the intelligentsia resented the military. The officers kept apart from the rest of society as a separate caste, and were therefore alienated from the common people. Within the military ranks there was a great deal of distrust and suspicion of common soldiers toward officers. The revolutionary intelligentsia considered the armed forces to be the main bulwark of the autocracy, showed a passionate hatred toward them and were waiting for the first chance to destroy this pillar of the old regime. All the strata of the population equally loathed the dreadful political police. The revolutionary intelligentsia were also distrustful of the clergy and Church hierarchy. Most of them were openly atheistic.

In want of an integrating middle class and a unifying ideology, all these warring strata, groups and factions were held together by the authority of the Czar, which was sanctioned by the Church and rested on the bureaucracy, the police and the armed forces. The influence of the Church, however, was greatly shattered, the bureaucracy was inefficient, self-concerned, full of internal tension, and not fullheartedly behind the existing regime, and the police were resented by all. The fate of the Czardom therefore depended exclusively upon the discipline and the loyalty of the military.

In such conditions, if the support of the armed forces would fail, both the Czar and the Czardom were doomed. This was well realized not only by the opposition, but by the Czar him-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

565 517 icism of its rank and file, that gave this Party an advantage over its main rival for power, the Party of Socialist Revolutionaries, in the chaotic days of 1917.

727 669 565 Just as it had happened in the past, a weakening of the prestige of the ruling classes as a result of defeats on the battlefield led to peasant uprisings. Almost immediately after the Czar's abdication, that is, in March, 1917, peasant rebellions arose in 34 districts and by June spread to 325 districts. The distrubances were again especially intensive in the upper Don and in the middle Volga, the regions where the tradition of revolt was strong and the situation for revolt matured owing to unsatisfactory conditions within the land communes.

665 669 The chaos that ensued in the village was emphasized by factional strife and indecision in the center. As a result of the fall of the old Czarist regime, the two most extreme revolutionary parties, the Socialist Revolutionaries and the Bolsheviks, entered into a contest for power. While the Socialist Revolutionaries controlled the Provisional Government (since May, 1917), the Bolsheviks did everything to undermine their regime and to seize the power for themselves. In the question of rural policies, the government of Socialist Revolutionaries attempted to stop the outbreaks of lawlessness and disorder in the villages by promising an equitable solution of all rural problems on the basis of laws that were to be passed by a Constitutional Assembly.

[425] [565] But the Bolsheviks counteracted such policies by inciting the peasants to seize the lands at once. The Bolsheviks also deliberately sharpened the existing social cleavages in the villages by inciting the lower peasant strata against the upper. The Bolshevised soldiers, on leave or deserting the front, pushed more moderate elements into the background and led the peasant mobs not only against the landlords, but also against the more prosperous peasant classes. Hence, attacks on *Khutoryane* (hereditary peasant homestead owners) and *otrubniki* (peasant individual property owners) were as frequent as those against the manorial estates.

Many soldiers deserted the front because the Bolshevik agitators told them that the land was being distributed back home and that those who were present would get the choice grounds. The government, controlled by the Socialist Revolutionaries,

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

of foreign loans and investments the process of industrialization and of economic autarchy, which was needed to develop military potential necessary to withstand internal and external threats, was proceeding at too slow a pace. This situation made it imperative for the impatient and insecure ruling class to have at hand goods available for quick export in order to buy foreign machinery and to industrialize and militarize the country at a higher speed.

The peasants in the meantime were busy in making improvements on their possessions and in raising the amount of food for home consumption. Increased peasant consumption of food however meant decrease of the crops available both for export and for the needs of fast growing urban strata which were being created as a result of a speedy industrialization. Also lack of regulation of agricultural production meant that planting and sowing were designed to a large extent to satisfy the home needs of the peasant, and only to a lesser extent those of the national or foreign market.

This meant that as long as a large section of the peasantry remained as independent producers there was always a danger that the ruling class might not have at its disposal sufficient quantities of marketable products. And the more the ruling faction felt insecure in its power, the more this potential threat of an economically independent peasantry seemed real and close. This feeling of insecurity and mistrust of the Bolsheviks was manifested in their hatred of the peasantry. "The peasant who has two cows is already an enemy," they would say. Hence the Party hierarchy made the decision not only to abolish the economic independence of the peasants, but also to "destroy peasantry as a class" by means of collectivization.

In their determination to "destroy peasantry as a class," the Bolsheviks first incited the poor and the medium peasants against the "kulaks" and then the landless against the small peasant owners. The Bolshevik agitators took advantage also of the traditional tensions within peasant families and aroused son against father and brother against brother. Thus inciting and exploiting resentments and hostilities between various peasant strata and taking advantage of family antagonisms, the Bolsheviks were able

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

to force the peasants to join the collectives and the state farms. Those who opposed such policies were resettled or banished to convict labor camps. Many were massacred. According to Stalin ten million peasants became victims of this "class war."[5]

In order to insure their complete control over the farming population, the Bolshevik leaders sent the most trusted Party people from the city to the village to manage the newly formed *kolhozes*. These *novye bary* (new lords), as the peasants called them, installed themselves in the mansions of former estate owners and kept themselves at a considerable distance from the rural population, not unlike the former serf-owners. And not unlike the former gentry the new masters were also bent upon extracting maximum labor from the peasantry with minimum reward.

Under such conditions, the peasants, in the first outbursts of their reaction against this state of abusive submission resorted to outward aggression in the form of traditional uprisings. They burnt their crops and slaughtered their cattle rather than collectivize them. It is estimated that almost two-thirds of the entire livestock and a large part of the crops were destroyed.[6] Such a situation affected even the Ukraine, the "granary of Russia" and greatly contributed to the famine of 1932–33 in which hundreds of thousands of people died of starvation and epidemics. It was by such active rebellion that the peasantry forced the Party into a temporary retreat. The Party had to appease the peasants by giving each peasant household the right to retain in private use a small plot of land, and also in private possession a limited number of livestock. Also, private trade in agricultural products was restored in a limited degree.[7]

These were however only temporary concessions, since the Bolsheviks were determined to completely "industrialize" the peasantry as a means of political and economic control. Following such aims the highest possible degree of specialization in farm operation has been fostered and the members of the same family have been assigned to different, spacially separated activities. In this manner the agricultural brigade instead of the peasant family became the basic unit of agricultural production. For the same reason the highest possible degree of mechanization of

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

517 upon the regime than the peasantry and industrial labor. The
642 objective of this policy has been to prevent among the intelligentsia formation of an *esprit de corps* and opposition to Bolshevik rule, and to command the services and unquestionable
[554] obedience of every educated man. These are the political foundations of the growing and deliberately fostered stress on rank and distinction, on social differentiation, sense of superiority and inferiority, absolute superordination and blind subordination.

• 565 In the upper strata, much more so than in the lower classes,
554 the process of hierarchal and functional differentiation is fostered and maintained not only by means of specialization of work and differences in rank, but also by means of sharply differentiated income, and by means of differential distribution of spoils, and of privileges. This sharp stratification of Soviet soci-
[557] ety, rooted in the traditions of the Czardom, in its own turn promotes power-seeking and domineering, dependency and subservience, as well as lack of social intimacy and lack of trust.

565 The highest privileges in the Soviet society are accruing to the
554 top ruling faction of professional conspirators. But this group is itself internally sharply differentiated. It is headed by the Party Leader (*Vozhd*), and is divided into a number of policy making bodies, among which the Political Bureau (Politburo), now to be known as the Presidium,[1] is of foremost importance. Though the members of the Presidium and of other top policy making bodies, such as the Secretariat, are formally appointed by the Central Committee of the Party, they are *de facto* selected by the supreme leader and therefore depend upon him for their position. Such a situation fosters bickering among top ranking officials in their mutual struggle to win the favors of the head man, which in turn enables the supreme Party leader to play one faction of his camarilla against the other one or—not unlike in the days of the Czars—to select a more intimate inner circle of a few most trusted persons on whom to rely for advice and help. These then assist the leader in selecting and in eliminating the members of the top ranking hierarchy, according to expediency and circumstances.

This highly concentrated power structure is supported by a

4.6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Party members. Together with the policy-making Party bodies they form the ruling class of the Soviet society. This top Party-state governing class consists perhaps of about two hundred thousand people or one tenth of one per cent of the total population. They are often referred to as the *Partia i Pravitelstvo*—the Party and the government.

The middle and lower layers of government specialists are often referred to as the *Sluzhashchie*. This stratum includes the rank and file of the learned professions, the rank and file of the intelligentsia and semi-intelligentsia, the middle and lower professional military, the middle and lower government managerial ranks, the engineers and the technicians. According to the 1939 census the number of those in the sluzhashchie class, that is "all those who work in offices" was close to thirty million or seventeen per cent of the total Soviet population, as contrasted to the industrial labor (*rabochie*) which formed thirty-two per cent and the peasantry (*krestiane*) which formed forty-six per cent of the total.

The more one goes down this social scale, the smaller becomes the proportion of Party members to non members and of the privileged to the non-privileged. One's position in this caste-like pyramid determines his status expressed not only in the form of income, but even more so in the extent to which he gets the benefits of various social services, the extent of appurtenances,[10] the amount of freedom of personal movement, and the degree of superordination and subordination.

The privileged position of the educated and semi-educated classes is well manifested in the internal structure of the Bolshevik Party. As late as 1930 about 65 percent of Party members were workers or recruited from the working class, about 20 percent were peasants or of peasant background, and less than 15 percent belonged to the white collar class. But by 1941–42 the composition of the Party was reversed and apparently at present more than 70 percent of the new candidates and members are recruited from among the educated and official classes.[11] The Party rules, which in the first years of Bolshevik regime had favored the industrial proletariat, and to a certain extent the soldiers and the collective peasants, had to be revised in order to

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ease the entrance of the upper classes into the Party ranks. This was done in 1939.[12] According to Pravda's figures, in 1947 out of five to six million Party members and candidates, about one-third had university or middle school education (1,700,000).[13] The extent to which these upper classes imposed their dominance over the Party is indicated by the figures according to which at the Eighteenth Party Conference in 1941, the percentage of delegates with a complete college or university education was 41.8 as against only 6.5 percent of the voting delegates with higher education at the Party Congress in 1924.[14]

Such a Party structure is very much out of proportion to the general ratio of educated to non-educated classes in the Soviet Union, since at least four-fifths of the Soviet subjects have less than high school education. The Bolshevik Party structure is also greatly out of proportion to the vocational composition of the Soviet Union where still about three-fourths of the population belong to the strata of peasants and of industrial labor. The conspiratorial nature of the Party, the complexity of the Soviet system of rule and the need for increasing specialization of Party members in activities on which the Bolshevik power rests, favor limitation of Party membership to the educated and ruling classes.

The meaning of education and specialization in Soviet power structure becomes clearer if the system of controlled schooling in the Soviet Union is kept in mind. Both university and middle school education are mainly within the reach of higher classes.[15] It is extremely difficult for the average industrial wage-earner or peasant to send any of his children to more than elementary school because the tuition fees and the living costs in educational centers are above his income. The low wages of the industrial labor and the peasantry make it necessary for all family members, including mother and young children, to contribute to the family income by full time or part time work. Also the government conscripts youths for labor reserve battalions mainly from these strata. The children and youths from these strata depend therefore entirely upon the government stipends if they have any ambition and necessary pretraining for higher education. However in selecting candidates for schooling at govern-

6: Tomatic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ment expense the Party recruits these in the first place from among specific categories of children, such as war orphans, illegitimate and delinquent children, and children of Party functionaries. Such children are considered to be most promising from the point of view of Party objectives.

It is mainly from the university student body that the new ruling classes and all needed experts of the Soviet Union are being recruited.[16] It is therefore of paramount importance that this reservoir of the ruling strata is kept well under control and that it is thoroughly ideologically indoctrinated and trained in unswerving loyalty and conformity to the Party. "Ideological training of Soviet students is a vital and integral part of all the work of district, city, province, and territory party committees."[17] It is therefore imperative that this body is highly selective and not overcrowded. Recruitment of university students from among higher classes and from selected categories of children serves well the Party objectives to perpetuate its power and to command unconditional submission of all to its will. Such policies also tend to solidify Soviet social structure along caste lines.[18]

III

The Bolsheviks have also employed other means to establish their absolute dominance. Following Anarchist precepts and practices, and driven by power-seeking and destructive aggression, they have justified a number of oppressive measures as being necessary "to hasten the liquidation of the capitalistic elements and to organize defense against capitalist encirclement which is as yet far from being, and will not soon be destroyed."[19] Their objectives were to be achieved not only by means of economic dependency, systematic indoctrination, planned social isolation and lack of trust, but also by means of relentless vigilance and systematic terror.

One of the most important instruments of such policies have been the courts of law. Soviet socialist law is defined as the "totality of the rules of conduct, established in the form of legislation—to the end of annihilating, completely and finally, capitalism and its survival in the economy, manner of life,

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Many observers of Soviet society have noticed that in this constant struggle for power, and sometimes in order to save their very lives, Soviet officials and intellectuals must be ready not only to inform on each other, but also to "throw mud" at the closest associates and friends as soon as these happen to fall in disgrace.[1] Denunciation of a friend is often "the best way out of a hole," they say. Many "pretend to deny and to disown those who fall in disgrace" or, frightened, "join in verbal lynching to protect themselves." There is a "malignant joy regarding a comrade's mistakes . . . exaggeration of mistakes."[2] They "rush to kick a man who is already down, to push him over the precipice." In such conditions "Friendship is strained with blood and betrayal; it is an object of fear and suspicion."[3] Even members of one's own family might be repudiated under such pressure.[4] At the same time the need for cringing before one's superiors is often compensated by arrogance, capriciousness, arbitrariness, insulting and humiliating treatment of his subordinates or of all unprotected.[5]

The sense of guilt, insecurity, and feelings of humiliation which develop in such circumstances are magnified by means of social isolation. This isolation is manifold in the Soviet society, especially in the upper ruling strata. Intimate personal contact and unfettered social and intellectual intercourse is officially frowned upon and is therefore very limited among the Party, Army, government and managerial hierarchies. Intimate fraternization with associates is looked upon with great suspicion in a society whose ruling minority maintains itself in power by means of planned social divisions and mistrusts. Said Stalin: ". . . such family conditions create a favorable environment for the nurture of reptiles, not Bolsheviks."[6]

Real risks are involved in any free discourse in a society which is infested with watchdogs and informers and in which many are inclined to seek self-advance in the ruin of others. In the upper strata besides fear, suspicion and need for extreme caution, there is lack of intimate contact also because of sharp differentiation in rank. For the same reasons intercourse between the educated and non-educated strata has to be kept to a minimum.

There is also a deliberate policy on the part of the ruling class

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

author, wrote a well known poem under the title *"Ubey ego"*—kill him.[14] In a similar manner Alexey Tolstoy, a well-known Soviet novelist, has published an essay entitled *Ubey Zverya*—Kill the Beast. "Kill him," writes Alexey Tolstoy, "that is your sacred command."[15] Mikhail Sholokhov, another prominent Soviet writer, wrote a pamphlet entitled *Nauka Nenavisti*—The Science of Hatred—in which he stressed, in a like way as the early Russian Anarchists and contemporary Soviet pedagogists, the necessity of ardent love for the Cause as a source of passionate hatred of all the opponents. To him, too, love seems to be necessary primarily as a means of hate.[16] "Hatred for enemies of the land of socialism is an inseparable feature of socialist ideology and the ideology of Leninism," the Bolsheviks repeatedly say.

Under the label "enemies" are classed not only the foreign "capitalists, imperialists, and reactionaries," and internal non-Party oppositionists, but also Party members who deviate from Party ideology, and "all sceptics, opportunists, capitulators, scabs, and traitors." Hatred and struggle against these "enemies" within the Party must be as merciless and ruthless as against external adversaries. This is considered to be imperative in a mortal struggle against the capitalist world:

> The history of the Party . . . teaches us that unless the Party of the working class wages an uncompromising struggle against the opportunists within its own ranks, unless it smashes the capitulators in its own midst . . . it cannot perform its role of organizer and leader of the proletarian revolution . . . If, while it is carrying on a life and death fight against the bourgeoisie, there are capitulators and traitors on its own staff, within its own fortress, the working class will be caught between two fires, from the front and the rear. Clearly such a struggle can only end in defeat.[17]

This conscious fomenting of intense hostility and animosity against internal, as well as external "enemies" as a means of survival in a "mortal struggle" is manifested in the language of Bolshevism. The words "liquidation" and "purge" which are often synonomous with killing and extermination of opponents became outstanding in Soviet vocabulary. There is an increasing use of words which convey ideas of hatred and violence and stimulate such feelings and practices. In Bolshevik stereotyped termi-